IA
Part B

FFY2015
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

336

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Since 1974, Iowa has been divided into intermediate agencies (Area Education Agencies) to provide specialized services. The AEAs were created in order to provide equity in the provision of programs and services across counties or merged areas. One key difference between Iowa's AEA system and intermediate units in other states is that Iowa's AEAs are mandatory. It is also mandatory that each local school district be assigned to an area education agency that will provide the services the school district needs. This is the only system in the country that has this tightly structured system.

The AEAs carry special education general supervision and compliance responsibilities and the charge to provide the services needed by the local school districts. Their primary role is provision of special education support services to individuals under the age of 21 years requiring special education and related services, media services to all children through grade 12, and other educational services to pupils and education staff. The AEAs also define the system used to locate and identify students suspected of having disabilities and provide the personnel to conduct evaluation activities in collaboration with LEAs.

Iowa's Part B general supervision system is a partnership between the Department of Education and the AEAs and is multifaceted. The components include: 1) support practices that improve educational outcomes for students (described under technical assistance and professional development); 2) use of multiple methods to identify and correct noncompliance within one year; and 3) mechanisms to encourage and support improvement and enforce compliance.

Dispute Resolution. The State uses a system for dispute resolution including both informal and formal mechanisms. Resolution Facilitation is a way to resolve differences instead of, or before use of, formal proceedings provided by the State. The SEA has written procedures for resolving any complaint, including a complaint filed by an organization or individual from another state. The SEA has widely disseminated these procedures to parents and other interested individuals, including the Iowa Parent Training and Information Center, Disability Rights Iowa, independent living centers and other appropriate entities. A Resolution Facilitator assists in resolving differences between parents, schools and private service providers. Mediation is voluntary on the part of all parties and conducted by a qualified and impartial mediator who is trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediation can occur at any time, even prior to the filing of a due process hearing request. Whenever a due process hearing request is filed, the parties involved in the dispute have an opportunity for an impartial due process hearing.

Monitoring - Area Education Agencies (intermediate agencies). Using a five-year cycle, the SEA conducts accreditation visits to each of Iowa's 9 Area Education Agencies. Two AEAs receive an accreditation visit each year. During this visit AEA documents are reviewed and internal (AEA staff) and external (Staff from school districts served by the AEA) interviews are held that relate to the agency's five-year Comprehensive Improvement Plan and the services the agency provides in accordance with the eight required standards and one optional standard outlined in Chapter 72 of the Iowa Code. During the accreditation process, the special education services the agency provides are a part of each of the eight required standards. A targeted interview is held with special education staff; topics discussed during this interview include the agency's State Performance Plan indicator data, LEA (district) special education procedural compliance data, the AEA's general supervision responsibilities and other AEA data used by the Iowa Department of Education to make the accreditation determination regarding the agency.

Monitoring - Local Education Agencies (school districts). Utilizing a five-year cycle, the SEA conducts accreditation visits to each of Iowa's public school districts. Approximately 20% of public school districts receive an accreditation visit each year. Districts have been assigned a specific year in the cycle for the on-site visit, with the cycle being maintained over time. Each year a balance of small, large, rural and urban districts are visited. The Accreditation Site Visit process includes Iowa Chapter 12, Equity, Special Education and Title Programs.

The year prior to a site visit, each district completes a special education procedural compliance review related to the implementation of IDEA. Data are collected through a Web-based tool, with a report developed for each district to identify individual student noncompliance and whether or not the issues are identified as a system level issue. If noncompliance is identified as a system level issue, the district must write a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and submit it to the AEA for approval prior to implementation. The AEA then monitors and verifies the correction of individual noncompliance as well as the implementation of the CAP. Individual student noncompliance is to be corrected within 60 school days and system level CAPs are to be fully implemented as soon as possible, but no later than one year from date of notification. After the AEA verifies that all corrections have been made, documentation is submitted to the SEA.

During the integrated site visit, multiple interviews take place on a variety of topics. The on-site visit allows for conversations to occur regarding student performance and implementation of the special education practices in the district. Interview groups include community partners, parents, teachers, school board, district administrators, and support staff. One of the interviews allows for district staff to be interviewed with a specific focus on special education practices and district level special education data. A comprehensive report written to the district identifies strengths, recommendations and any noncompliance in all of the areas reviewed during the site visit. Any special education noncompliance identified during the site visit must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from date of notification.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Iowa's technical assistance system as distinguished by OSEP, is intricately entwined with Iowa's professional development system. This section, therefore, describes the structures which support technical assistance and professional development. The activities and strategies used for technical assistance and professional development are explained within the description of Iowa's professional development system.

Iowa's technical assistance system has long been a partnership between the Department of Education, AEAS and LEAs. Recently, however, that partnership has reorganized into something known as Collaborating for Iowa's Kids (C4K). C4K is a partnership among area education agencies, the Iowa Department of Education and local school districts. The intent of C4K is to work more effectively and efficiently as a full educational system to accomplish a few agreed upon priorities within a multi-tiered system of support as a framework to implement Iowa's rigorous standards. The first areas of focus are early literacy and closing the achievement gaps with the

ultimate goal that every child is proficient by the end of third grade.

Collaborating for Iowa's Kids (C4K) was conceptualized within Iowa's Area Education Agency system as a way to more effectively work as partners with the Iowa Department of Education (DE) as well as across the AEA system. Established in 2011-12, the partnership includes:

- Collective commitment across AEAs and the DE to work as a unified system;
- Agreement that the role of the DE is to set direction and lead, and the role of the AEAs is to implement;
- Agreement that LEAs are integral, and need to be included in C4K; and
- Commitment to focus efforts and resources on selected priorities.

C4K accomplishes broad stakeholder involvement through a complex set of structures, including: governance teams (oversight, work, task, and implementation teams), external coaches and building leadership teams. These new structures have provided leverage in four ways: (1) Alignment of resources, including fiscal and personnel, focused on one priority (literacy) across priority areas that have the greatest success across children/youth (work teams); (2) Collaboration of the DE, AEA and LEAs as part of C4K; (3) Identification/development of evidence-based frameworks, strategies and programs by experts in the field regardless of affiliation or location; and (4) Intentional statewide scaling based on implementation science.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Using the structures described above, Iowa employs its own model of professional development, established from evidence based practices of professional learning. The Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM) is an integrated cycle of planning, ongoing implementation and evaluation. It emphasizes ongoing support and feedback for the learning and application of new skills. Iowa Administrative Code requires each district's professional development plans to meet the following standards:

1. Align with the Iowa teaching standards and criteria;
2. Deliver research-based instructional strategies aligned with the student achievement goals established by the district;
3. Deliver professional development training and learning opportunities that are targeted at improvement of instruction and designed with the following components:
    - Student achievement data and analysis;
    - Theory about learning and instruction;
    - Classroom demonstration and practice;
    - Classroom observation and self-reflection;
    - Teacher collaboration and study of teacher implementation; and
    - Integration of instructional technology, if applicable;
4. Include an evaluation component of professional development that measures improvement in instructional practice and its impact on student learning; and
5. Support the professional development needs of district certified staff responsible for instruction.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: ☐ apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

The State will report to the public progress and/or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website (https://www.educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/state-requirements-reports) sometime after Feb 1, 2017 but no later than April 1, 2017, the FFY 2015 (2015-2016) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2015 (2015-2016) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2017.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2017.

AEA profiles are posted at: https://www.educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/data-profiles

District profiles are posted at: https://www.educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/data-profiles

Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at: https://www.educateiowa.gov/documents/pk-12/2013/04/iowas-accountability-workbook-revised-february-15-2011

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			11.20%	75.70%	91.30%	91.30%	83.00%	85.00%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%
Data			15.19%	15.25%	84.38%	70.41%	70.73%	69.96%	72.74%	72.74%	76.35%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	93.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for this measure must align to the measurable objectives for all students and subgroups used in the State's Accountability Workbook under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,377	
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,386	null
SY 2014-15 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/4/2016	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	76.99%	Calculate

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
3,377	4,386	76.35%	93.00%	76.99%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Graduation in the State of Iowa is defined as (1) a student who has received a regular diploma who completed all unmodified district graduation requirements in the standard number of four years, or (2) students receiving a regular diploma from an alternative placement within the district, or who have had the requirements modified in accordance with a disability. Students who have finished the high school program but did not earn a diploma, or earned a certificate of attendance or other credential in lieu of a diploma are not considered graduates (Iowa NCLB Accountability Workbook).
Data for this measure are reported using the Title I cohort graduation rate. The four-year fixed cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in the cohort (denominator) who graduate with a regular

high school diploma in four years or less by the number of first-time 9th graders enrolled in the fall four years earlier minus the number of students who transferred out plus the total number of students who transferred in.
Please note that data reported for the current reporting period are from one year previous as described in the table below.
Title I Cohort Graduation Rate = (FG + TIG) / (F + TI - TO)

FG First-time 9th grade students in fall of 2009 and graduated in 2013 or sooner
TIG Students who transferred in grades 9 to 12 and graduate in 2013 or sooner
F First-time 9th grade students in fall of 2009
TI Transferred in the first-time 9th graders' cohort in grades 9 to 12
TO Transfer out (including emigrates and deceased)

First-time freshmen and transferred-in students include: resident students attending a public school in the district; non-resident students open-enrolled in, whole-grade sharing in, or tuition in; and foreign students on Visa. Those excluded are: home-schooled and nonpublic schooled students; public school students enrolled in another district but taking courses on a part-time basis; and foreign exchange students.
Students receiving regular diplomas are included as graduates in the numerator. Early graduates are included in the original cohort. All students who take longer to graduate (including students with IEPs) are included in the denominator but not in the numerator for the four-year rate.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0.67%	0.60%	14.08%	14.08%	12.90%	11.73%	10.56%	21.50%	21.00%
Data		0.50%	0.35%	0.35%	15.25%	7.94%	7.40%	5.88%	21.49%	19.09%	17.54%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	20.50%	20.00%	19.50%	19.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa Department of Education staff developed targets for performance indicators using available data and knowledge of current practices. Proposed targets and rational were presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for approval.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,194	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	null	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	42	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	716	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	14	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
716	3,966	17.54%	20.50%	18.05%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.89%	99.39%	99.62%	99.37%	98.92%	98.34%	98.96%	97.65%	98.94%	98.70%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.35%	99.34%	99.77%	99.46%	99.39%	98.76%	98.89%	98.11%	99.22%	98.79%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.26%	99.30%	99.82%	99.48%	99.40%	98.85%	99.16%	97.20%	98.98%	98.51%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.20%	99.37%	99.70%	99.55%	99.66%	98.51%	99.04%	97.57%	98.60%	98.39%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.54%	99.22%	99.66%	99.17%	99.47%	97.73%	98.53%	96.80%	97.90%	97.78%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.53%	99.51%	99.83%	99.39%	99.36%	97.39%	98.36%	96.25%	97.13%	96.49%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		97.61%	99.12%	99.40%	98.26%	98.19%	94.50%	96.14%	93.40%	94.99%	93.27%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.85%	99.30%	99.46%	99.08%	99.30%	98.29%	99.13%	98.40%	99.01%	98.68%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.22%	99.18%	99.60%	99.46%	99.28%	98.62%	99.08%	98.43%	99.20%	98.83%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.04%	99.20%	99.37%	99.22%	99.26%	98.67%	99.31%	98.17%	99.14%	98.57%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.10%	99.21%	99.50%	99.49%	99.62%	98.43%	99.04%	98.07%	98.67%	98.39%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.42%	99.06%	99.51%	99.17%	99.37%	96.95%	98.70%	97.36%	98.18%	97.88%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.29%	99.08%	98.84%	96.82%	99.26%	97.06%	98.52%	96.77%	96.98%	96.60%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		97.53%	99.00%	99.19%	98.43%	98.75%	93.88%	96.24%	93.62%	94.97%	92.45%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
	G ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	**A ≥** Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for this measure must align to the measurable objectives for all students and subgroups used in the State's Accountability Workbook under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	4,903	4,806	98.70%	95.00%	98.02%
B Grade 4	5,072	4,998	98.79%	95.00%	98.54%
C Grade 5	5,070	4,988	98.51%	95.00%	98.38%
D Grade 6	4,933	4,820	98.39%	95.00%	97.71%
E Grade 7	4,850	4,732	97.78%	95.00%	97.57%
F Grade 8	4,686	4,530	96.49%	95.00%	96.67%
G HS	3,911	3,668	93.27%	95.00%	93.79%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	4,902	4,816	98.68%	95.00%	98.25%
B Grade 4	5,073	5,000	98.83%	95.00%	98.56%
C Grade 5	5,070	4,988	98.57%	95.00%	98.38%
D Grade 6	4,929	4,823	98.39%	95.00%	97.85%
E Grade 7	4,850	4,727	97.88%	95.00%	97.46%
F Grade 8	4,689	4,530	96.60%	95.00%	96.61%
G HS	3,908	3,653	92.45%	95.00%	93.47%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

https://www.educateiowa.gov/pk-12/no-child-left-behind/nclb-state-report-cards
https://www.educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/state-requirements-and-reports/idea-section-618-data-part-b-and-c

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			32.80%	74.10%	74.10%	74.10%	80.60%	87.10%	93.50%	100%	100%
			Data		31.97%	36.75%	36.28%	38.47%	39.38%	42.16%	38.58%	38.34%	39.61%	37.41%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			37.46%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	82.00%	88.00%	94.00%	100%	100%
			Data		36.32%	41.68%	38.92%	45.01%	41.23%	48.08%	35.51%	35.36%	36.20%	35.93%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			35.58%	76.40%	76.40%	76.40%	82.30%	88.20%	94.10%	100%	100%
			Data		34.58%	40.01%	37.96%	43.18%	41.32%	44.26%	33.64%	36.25%	35.40%	35.43%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			24.26%	69.70%	69.70%	69.70%	77.30%	84.80%	92.40%	100%	100%
			Data		23.26%	24.86%	26.24%	28.08%	26.83%	28.45%	22.15%	23.19%	33.07%	30.76%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			24.27%	71.50%	71.50%	71.50%	78.70%	85.80%	92.90%	100%	100%
			Data		23.27%	26.36%	24.55%	28.16%	26.67%	30.69%	22.54%	23.62%	30.45%	30.82%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			26.33%	73.30%	73.30%	73.30%	80.00%	86.70%	93.30%	100%	100%
			Data		24.72%	25.93%	25.11%	27.71%	28.81%	29.28%	20.25%	19.82%	30.05%	27.27%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥			28.98%	79.30%	79.30%	79.30%	84.50%	89.70%	94.80%	100%	100%
			Data		32.17%	27.06%	32.19%	28.63%	35.23%	30.42%	38.28%	37.81%	31.75%	32.00%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			42.36%	73.90%	73.90%	73.90%	80.50%	87.00%	93.50%	100%	100%
			Data		41.36%	46.24%	44.91%	47.50%	50.21%	49.84%	51.35%	49.28%	53.43%	48.06%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			45.87%	74.70%	74.70%	74.70%	81.00%	87.30%	93.70%	100%	100%
			Data		45.63%	50.02%	48.44%	50.05%	50.08%	51.98%	47.38%	46.12%	46.60%	44.13%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			44.20%	76.60%	76.60%	76.60%	82.30%	88.30%	94.20%	100%	100%
			Data		43.20%	43.20%	45.98%	46.31%	48.90%	46.27%	43.15%	44.77%	39.66%	35.56%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			33.92%	72.80%	72.80%	72.80%	79.60%	86.40%	93.20%	100%	100%
			Data		32.92%	33.32%	36.44%	35.51%	36.99%	36.63%	30.01%	31.95%	37.57%	31.78%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			30.30%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	79.00%	86.00%	93.00%	100%	100%
			Data		29.30%	35.52%	32.83%	37.04%	34.31%	40.34%	36.12%	35.61%	45.36%	41.40%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			30.14%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	79.00%	86.00%	93.00%	100%	100%
			Data		27.63%	30.83%	29.95%	32.48%	31.41%	35.60%	27.76%	27.83%	31.72%	27.37%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥			36.53%	79.30%	79.30%	79.30%	84.50%	89.70%	94.80%	100%	100%
			Data		31.71%	34.50%	31.79%	35.20%	32.52%	34.61%	44.05%	43.73%	44.10%	40.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	100%	100%	100%	100%
	B ≥ Grade 4	100%	100%	100%	100%
	C ≥ Grade 5	100%	100%	100%	100%
	D ≥ Grade 6	100%	100%	100%	100%
	E ≥ Grade 7	100%	100%	100%	100%
	F ≥ Grade 8	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
	G ≥ HS	100%	100%	100%	100%
Math	**A ≥** Grade 3	100%	100%	100%	100%
	B ≥ Grade 4	100%	100%	100%	100%
	C ≥ Grade 5	100%	100%	100%	100%
	D ≥ Grade 6	100%	100%	100%	100%
	E ≥ Grade 7	100%	100%	100%	100%
	F ≥ Grade 8	100%	100%	100%	100%
	G ≥ HS	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for this measure must align to the measurable objectives for all students and subgroups used in the State's Accountability Workbook under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	4,806	1,773	37.41%	100%	36.89%
B Grade 4	4,998	1,760	35.93%	100%	35.21%
C Grade 5	4,988	1,733	35.43%	100%	34.74%
D Grade 6	4,820	1,432	30.76%	100%	29.71%
E Grade 7	4,732	1,344	30.82%	100%	28.40%
F Grade 8	4,530	1,190	27.27%	100%	26.27%
G HS	3,668	1,030	32.00%	100%	28.08%

Explanation of Group D Slippage

The State attributes slippage to a lack of coordinated services and standards throughout the state. While Iowa has adopted the Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics it is still in the beginning stages of implementing these standards. A lack of consistent standards and instructional practices across the LEAs has attributed to the lack of progress. The State is addressing this issue with a new RTI database and the consistent use of universal screening and progress monitoring assessments. Standards-based IEP goals will be used to ensure rigorous targets in the area of reading for kindergarten through grade 8.

Explanation of Group E Slippage

The State attributes slippage to a lack of coordinated services and standards throughout the state. While Iowa has adopted the Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics it is still in the beginning stages of implementing these standards. A lack of consistent standards and instructional practices across the LEAs has attributed to the lack of progress. The State is addressing this issue with a new RTI database and the consistent use of universal screening and progress monitoring assessments. Standards-based IEP goals will be used to ensure rigorous targets in the area of reading for kindergarten through grade 8.

Explanation of Group G Slippage

The State attributes slippage to a lack of coordinated services and standards throughout the state. While Iowa has adopted the Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics it is still in the beginning stages of implementing these standards. A lack of consistent standards and instructional practices across the LEAs has attributed to the lack of progress. The State is addressing this issue with a new RTI database and the consistent use of universal screening and progress monitoring assessments. Standards-based IEP goals will be used to ensure rigorous targets in the area of reading for kindergarten through grade 8.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	4,816	2,342	48.06%	100%	48.63%
B Grade 4	5,000	2,202	44.13%	100%	44.04%
C Grade 5	4,988	1,762	35.56%	100%	35.32%
D Grade 6	4,823	1,478	31.78%	100%	30.64%
E Grade 7	4,727	1,989	41.40%	100%	42.08%
F Grade 8	4,530	1,200	27.37%	100%	26.49%
G HS	3,653	1,390	40.00%	100%	38.05%

Explanation of Group D Slippage

The State attributes slippage to a lack of coordinated services and standards throughout the state. While Iowa has adopted the Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics it is still in the beginning stages of implementing these standards. A lack of consistent standards and instructional practices across the LEAs has attributed to the lack of progress. The State is addressing this issue with a new RTI database and the consistent use of universal screening and progress monitoring assessments. Standards-based IEP goals will be used to ensure rigorous targets in the area of math for kindergarten through grade 8.

Explanation of Group G Slippage

The State attributes slippage to a lack of coordinated services and standards throughout the state. While Iowa has adopted the Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics it is still in the beginning stages of implementing these standards. A lack of consistent standards and instructional practices across the LEAs has attributed to the lack of progress. The State is addressing this issue with a new RTI database and the consistent use of universal screening and progress monitoring assessments. Standards-based IEP goals will be used to ensure rigorous targets in the area of math for kindergarten through grade 8.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

https://www.educateiowa.gov/pk-12/no-child-left-behind/nclb-state-report-cards
https://www.educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/state-requirements-and-reports/idea-section-618-data-part-b-and-c

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. **Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and**
B. **Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.30%	1.20%	1.00%	1.00%	1.50%	1.50%
Data		1.36%	2.20%	3.01%	2.75%	1.11%	1.11%	1.39%	1.99%	1.45%	1.76%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.40%	1.40%	1.30%	1.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa Department of Education staff developed targets for performance indicators using available data and knowledge of current practices. Proposed targets and rational were presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for approval.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ○ Number of districts in the State
- ◉ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
6	331	1.76%	1.40%	1.81%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- ◉ Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- ○ The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State's definition of significant discrepancy is 2.00% above the state average in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. The state uses both in-school and out-of-school suspensions as well as expulsions in making this calculation.

In-school and out-of-school suspension are both defined as an "administrative or school board removal of a student from school classes or activities for disciplinary reasons," with a student still being under the supervision of school officials during an in-school suspension. Expulsion is defined as "a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons," (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2006).

The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts 2.00% or more above of the state average in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year, (2) dividing the number of districts with this significant discrepancy by the total number of districts in the state, and (3) multiplying by 100.

Iowa does not determine a district to have a significant discrepancy unless the district has a minimum of ten students with disabilities enrolled.

State Average	0.56
Threshold for Significantly Discrepant	2.56
Districts Omitted - Did Not Meet Minimum n	5

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

Districts identified as significantly discrepant participate in a district review consisting of the following areas relating to discipline/suspensions and expulsions: (1) A review and examination of district discipline data, (2) A review of policies, procedures and practices, (3) A review of documents (i.e., individual IEPs, student handbook to ensure alignment with board polices, etc.), (4) A review of the district Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and (5) The development of a Corrective Action Plan, if necessary.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
  - The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

    Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

    Completed reviews (self-assessment) and the Corrective Action Plan are reviewed by the State and a desk audit is conducted to verify findings. The desk audit consists of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings is made by the State and a review of the Corrective Action Plan is conducted to ensure policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.
  - The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Completed reviews (self-assessment) and the Corrective Action Plan are reviewed by the State and a desk audit is conducted to verify findings. The desk audit consists of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings is made by the State and a review of the Corrective Action Plan is conducted to ensure policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State (a) reviewed and revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, (b) reviewed and/or revised procedures for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005, and (c) reviewed and revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005. The State determined that districts were considered noncompliant in this area primarily due to lack of (a) review and revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, (b) the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards, and (c) training of staff regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 and PBIS. As part of a corrective action plan, districts are required to provide evidence to the State that any required corrections were completed and when the corrections were completed. The State also verified that in each program for which noncompliance was identified, the specific regulatory requirements were being correctly implemented by ensuring that the LEA had adopted and been trained in statewide procedures for the development and implementation if IEPs that are aligned with Iowa's Special Education Rules, Iowa Code, and Federal Code. Monitoring of corrective actions is carried out by the State's monitoring consultant.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. **Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and**
B. **Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0.55%	1.94%	0.28%	0.28%	0.30%	2.05%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
13	5	331	2.05%	0%	1.51%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State's definition of significant discrepancy is 2.00% above the state average in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. The state uses both in-school and out-of-school suspensions as well as expulsions in making this calculation.

In-school and out-of-school suspension are both defined as an "administrative or school board removal of a student from school classes or activities for disciplinary reasons," with a student still being under the supervision of school officials during an in-school suspension. Expulsion is defined as "a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons," (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2006).

The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts 2.00% or more above of the state average in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year by race/ethnicity, (2) dividing the number of districts with this significant discrepancy by the total number of districts in the state, and (3) multiplying by 100.

Iowa does not determine a district to have a significant discrepancy unless the district has a minimum of ten students with disabilities enrolled.

State Average	0.56
Threshold for Significantly Discrepant	2.56
Districts Omitted - Did Not Meet Minimum n	5

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

Districts identified as significantly discrepant participate in a district review consisting of the following areas relating to discipline/suspensions and expulsions: (1) A review and examination of district discipline data, (2) A review of policies, procedures and practices, (3) A review of documents (i.e., individual IEPs, student handbook to ensure alignment with board polices, etc.), (4) A review of the district Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and (5) The development of a Corrective Action Plan, if necessary.

- (●) The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- ( ) The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Completed reviews (self-assessment) and the Corrective Action Plan are reviewed by the State and a desk audit is conducted to verify findings. The desk audit consists of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings is made by the State and a review of the Corrective Action Plan is conducted to ensure policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State (a) reviewed and revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, (b) reviewed and/or revised procedures for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005, and (c) reviewed and revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005. The State determined that districts were considered noncompliant in this area primarily due to lack of (a) review and revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, (b) the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards, and (c) training of staff regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 and PBIS. As part of a corrective action plan, districts are required to provide evidence to the State that any required corrections were completed and when the corrections were completed. The State also verified that in each program for which noncompliance was identified, the specific regulatory requirements were being correctly implemented by ensuring that the LEA had adopted and been trained in statewide procedures for the development and implementation if IEPs that are aligned with Iowa's Special Education Rules, Iowa Code, and Federal Code. Monitoring of corrective actions is carried out by the State's monitoring consultant.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. **Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;**
B. **Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and**
C. **In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			44.00%	50.00%	55.00%	65.00%	75.00%	75.00%	80.00%	65.00%	65.00%
		Data		49.00%	55.05%	59.97%	61.81%	61.72%	63.47%	64.18%	64.03%	64.51%	64.92%
B	2005	Target ≤			13.60%	13.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%	9.50%	9.00%
		Data		10.80%	9.09%	8.03%	7.72%	8.36%	4.37%	8.76%	8.37%	8.38%	8.60%
C	2005	Target ≤			3.80%	3.70%	3.70%	3.60%	3.50%	3.30%	3.10%	3.00%	2.90%
		Data		4.00%	3.60%	3.47%	3.52%	2.33%	2.06%	1.60%	1.33%	1.83%	1.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%
Target B ≤	8.50%	8.00%	7.50%	7.00%
Target C ≤	2.80%	2.70%	2.60%	2.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa Department of Education staff developed targets for performance indicators using available data and knowledge of current practices. Proposed targets and rational were presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for approval.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	57,596	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	37,801	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,127	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	563	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	319	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	24	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	37,801	57,596	64.92%	65.00%	65.63%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,127	57,596	8.60%	8.50%	8.90%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	906	57,596	1.80%	2.80%	1.57%

Explanation of B Slippage

Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for one of the two settings under Indicator 5 for the current reporting period using the same data reported under IDEA section 618.

The target was not met for number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. The percent increased from 8.60 percent during the prior reporting period to 8.90 percent.

Slippage on this indicator is attributed to annual fluctuations in the data.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. **Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and**
B. **Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									40.00%	40.00%	41.00%
		Data								38.54%	36.38%	35.78%	34.36%
B	2011	Target ≤									8.35%	9.00%	8.00%
		Data								9.35%	9.41%	7.85%	7.17%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	42.00%	43.00%	44.00%	45.00%
Target B ≤	7.00%	6.00%	5.00%	4.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa Department of Education staff developed targets for performance indicators using available data and knowledge of current practices. Proposed targets and rational were presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for approval.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	6,226	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,100	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	393	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b2. Number of children attending separate school	12	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,100	6,226	34.36%	42.00%	33.73%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	407	6,226	7.17%	7.00%	6.54%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. **Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);**
B. **Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and**
C. **Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						69.75%	73.25%	76.75%	80.25%	62.00%	63.00%
		Data					66.25%	69.29%	66.26%	62.10%	60.40%	54.02%	60.92%
A2	2008	Target ≥						57.04%	60.54%	64.04%	67.54%	55.00%	56.00%
		Data					53.54%	50.54%	53.93%	55.43%	53.73%	45.94%	54.69%
B1	2008	Target ≥						77.47%	80.97%	84.47%	87.97%	70.00%	71.00%
		Data					73.97%	73.14%	67.69%	68.85%	69.16%	68.52%	68.42%
B2	2008	Target ≥						38.42%	41.92%	45.42%	48.92%	28.50%	30.00%
		Data					34.92%	29.65%	25.80%	29.96%	26.63%	24.46%	29.44%
C1	2008	Target ≥						60.17%	63.67%	67.17%	70.67%	60.00%	61.00%
		Data					56.67%	59.21%	63.46%	59.45%	59.20%	50.89%	56.65%
C2	2008	Target ≥						58.48%	61.98%	65.48%	68.98%	62.00%	63.00%
		Data					54.98%	57.14%	60.19%	62.04%	61.57%	54.16%	62.27%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%
Target A2 ≥	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target B1 ≥	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%
Target B2 ≥	31.50%	33.00%	34.50%	36.00%
Target C1 ≥	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
Target C2 ≥	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa Department of Education staff developed targets for performance indicators using available data and knowledge of current practices. Proposed targets and rational were presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for approval.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	1934.00

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	24.00	1.24%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	456.00	23.58%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	374.00	19.34%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	442.00	22.85%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	638.00	32.99%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	816.00	1296.00	60.92%	64.00%	62.96%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	1080.00	1934.00	54.69%	57.00%	55.84%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	18.00	0.93%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	503.00	26.01%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	794.00	41.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	553.00	28.59%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	66.00	3.41%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1347.00	1868.00	68.42%	72.00%	72.11%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	619.00	1934.00	29.44%	31.50%	32.01%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	29.00	1.50%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	454.00	23.47%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	288.00	14.89%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	401.00	20.73%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	762.00	39.40%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	689.00	1172.00	56.65%	62.00%	58.79%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	1163.00	1934.00	62.27%	64.00%	60.13%

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for two of the three outcomes under Indicator 7.

The target was not met and slippage occured for the percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. The percent decreased from 62.27 percent during the prior reporting period to 60.13 percent.

Slippage on this indicator is attributed to annual fluctuations in the data.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? Yes

Will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? Yes

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Preschool	2005	Target ≥			72.50%	75.50%	78.50%	80.00%	80.00%	82.50%	85.00%	
		Data		72.50%	74.60%	78.05%	77.70%	78.27%	77.26%	82.30%	82.70%	
School Age	2005	Target ≥			61.00%	64.00%	67.00%	69.00%	69.00%	72.00%	75.00%	
		Data		61.00%	61.46%	69.09%	71.37%	65.79%	71.32%	67.81%	73.35%	

	FFY	2014
Preschool	Target ≥	85.00%
	Data	85.75%
School Age	Target ≥	75.00%
	Data	73.99%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Preschool Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
School-age Target ≥	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa Department of Education staff developed targets for performance indicators using available data and knowledge of current practices. Proposed targets and rational were presented to the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC) and the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for approval.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
Preschool	279.00	346.00	85.75%	85.00%	80.64%
School-age	236.00	310.00	73.99%	75.00%	76.13%

Explanation of Preschool Slippage

Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for Indicator 8 for preschool aged children for the current reporting period.

The respondent parents who reported schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities decreased from 85.75 percent during the prior reporting period to 80.64 percent. The State attributes this slippage to annual fluctuations in the data.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Selection bias was avoided to the largest possible extent by randomizing the selection of participants, giving the contact information of potential participants to personnel administering the survey in random order, and providing a script to personnel administering the survey. Response data were then analyzed to determine the extent to which bias based on age, race or gender were pervasive in the data. Results of this assessment are provided in the attached document

titled B8 Representativeness. (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category.)

Survey responses that included missing answers or answers marked “not applicable” were included in the data analyses, but the missing data points were not included in either the numerator or denominator in determining the overall opinion of the respondent.

Was sampling used? Yes
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes
Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

- (•) **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**
- ( ) **No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State**

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

In order to obtain the sample for the current reporting period, a representative sample of parents of children with IEPs was drawn from each AEA proportionately by population. Sample size was determined using a 95 percent level of confidence with a 10 percent margin of error. In addition to the necessary sample size, an alternate sample of an additional 30 percent was drawn to be used, if necessary, when repeated attempts to contact the original selected parent(s) failed. The sample was drawn with a high level of confidence in order to ensure representativeness given an adequate response rate, and responses were later assessed for representativeness by age, race and gender. Results of this assessment are provided in the attached document titled B8 Representativeness. (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category.)

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	10.00%	22.22%	11.11%	11.11%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ○ Number of districts in the State
- ◉ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	9	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

AEAs are the subrecipients of Part B funds in the state of Iowa and are considered Iowa's LEAs for the purposes of reporting in the SPP and APR, as reflected in Iowa's State Eligibility Document on file with OSEP. In addition, because Iowa's Area Education Agencies carry primary responsibility for conducting child-find activities, data for Indicator 9 were examined at the AEA level.

The paragraphs that follow summarize Iowa's (a) definition of Disproportionate Representation, (b) measurement strategy for determining disproportionate representation, (c) *n* size used for calculations, and (d) process for determining if Disproportionate Representation was a result of Inappropriate Identification.

State Definition of Disproportionate Representation. Consistent with the "Disproportionality: Discussion of SPP/APR Response Table Language" (North Central Regional Resource Center), in response to the OSEP Analysis/Next Steps in the Iowa Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table, and in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.600 (d) (3), the SEA defines disproportionate overrepresentation as occurring when the weighted risk ratio or alternate risk ratio is greater than 2.00.

Measurement of Disproportionate Representation. In FFY 2007 (2007-2008) Iowa changed calculations used to determine disproportionate representation from the composition index to a weighted risk ratio.

Risk ratios are preferable to the composition index because the size of a risk ratio is not dependent upon the composition of the state or district's total enrollment. In addition, the size of a risk ratio is not dependent on differences in overall special education identification rates. Weighted risk ratios, therefore, can be directly compared across districts and ranked in order to target assistance efforts. The large number of small schools in Iowa with low ethnic enrollment make the weighted risk ratio a more appropriate measurement strategy than a composition index or unweighted risk ratio for disproportionate representation.

The race/ethnicity categories used for analysis were: African American, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander, Caucasian, and Multiple Races. The formula for the weighted risk ratio is:

$$\text{Weighted risk ratio} = \frac{R_i}{\sum_{j \neq I} w_j R_j} = \frac{(1-p_i) R_i}{\sum_{j \neq i} p_j R_j}$$

where R_i is the district-level risk for racial/ethnic group i, and p_i is the state-level proportion of students from racial/ethnic group i. $R_j$is the district-level risk for

the j-th racial/ethnic group, and p_j is the state-level proportion of students from the j-th racial/ethnic group.

An alternate risk ratio is calculated if there are at least ten students with IEPs in the ethnic group of interest, but fewer than ten students with IEPs in the comparison group. The alternate risk ratio is calculated by modifying the above equation so that the district-level risk for the racial/ethnic group (R_j) is divided by the state-level risk for all other students.

Cell Sizes for Calculating Disproportionate Representation. Because of the large number of schools in Iowa with low ethnic enrollment, the cell size used for calculating weighted risk ratio and the alternate risk ratio was set at 10. Iowa believes this "n" is statistically appropriate given the composition of schools in Iowa.

Determining if Disproportionate Representation is Due to Inappropriate Practices.
Iowa has developed a Disproportionality Review that is conducted at the AEA level. The process involves a formal review in which the AEA examines and evaluates the following areas:

Section 1: Review of Data,

Section 2: Review of Related Issues and Practices,

Section 3: Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices,

Section 4: Technical Assistance/Professional Development, and

Section 5: Results/Findings

The data review consists of the AEA examining its collection and use of data, (e.g., how data are disaggregated, analyzed, used to make decisions, guide practices, etc.). The review of related issues and practices consists of the examination of key areas that have been identified as impacting the area of disproportionality (e.g., utilization of universal screening; administrator/personnel understanding of special education procedures and requirements regarding referral, evaluation, identification, placement, discipline, LRE; attempts to rule out exclusionary factors during the evaluation process, etc.)

The process also consists of a formal review of policies, procedures and practices regarding the following areas: child find, parent participation, general education interventions, systematic problem-solving process, progress monitoring and data collection, determination of eligibility and evaluations/reevaluations. In addition, the AEA describes the technical assistance and/or professional development that is being conducted at the AEA and in districts regarding and/or related to disproportionality (e.g., differentiation of instruction, progress monitoring, cultural competency, understanding racial biases, etc.).

The AEAs submit the completed review document and findings to the SEA. A team of consultants meet to review and discuss the results and findings. A final determination of whether or not disproportionality is a result of inappropriate identification is made by the SEA.

AEAs identified with noncompliance work in collaboration with the SEA in developing a corrective action plan. Areas of noncompliance are to be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

Summary of Process Used to Determine if Disproportionality was Due to Inappropriate Practice.

State Policy. The State of Iowa has policies and procedures designed to prevent inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity of children with disabilities, consistent with 34 CFR § 300.8, 20 U. S. C. 1418 (d), 20 U. S. C 1412 (a) (24), 34 CFR § 300.173. The State of Iowa and has procedures requiring use of a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental, and academic information, including information provided by the parent, that may assist in determining whether the child is a child with a disability, and the content of the child's IEP, consistent with 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (2); 34 CFR § 300.304 (b). The State of Iowa has policies ensuring that assessments and other evaluation materials used to assess a child under 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis, are provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, and other requirements for assessment in all areas of suspected disability, by trained and knowledgeable personnel (20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (3)); 34 CFR § 300.304 (c). The State of Iowa has policies that determination that the child has a disability and the educational needs of the child shall be made by a group of qualified professionals and the parent, in accordance with § 300.306 (b), 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (4), 34 CFR § 300.306 (a). The State of Iowa has policies that, in making a determination of eligibility, a child shall not be determined to be a child with a disability if the determinant factor for such determination is: lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction (as defined in Section 1208 (3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965); lack of appropriate instruction in math; or limited English proficiency; or if the child does not otherwise meet the eligibility criteria under 34 CFR § 300.8 (a) [20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (5); 34 CFR § 300.306 (b)]. The State of Iowa has policies that, in interpreting evaluation data for the purpose of determining if a child is a child with a disability under § 300.8, and the educational needs of the child, each public agency must draw upon information from a variety of sources, and ensure that information from all these sources is documented and carefully considered [20 U. S. C. 1414 (c); 34 CFR § 300.306 (c)].

References

Gamm, S. (2009). *Disproportionality in Special Education: Where and Why Overidentification of Minority Students Occurs*. LRP Publications.

Kozleski, E. B., & Zion, S. (2007). *Preventing Disproportionality by Strengthening District Policies and Procedures – An Assessment and Strategic Planning Process*. Downloaded August 1, 2009 from www.nccrest.org.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Iowa is noncategorical and is not required to submit data for Indicator B10.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

This indicator is not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.31%	90.01%	94.28%	97.74%	98.04%	98.21%	97.97%	98.59%	98.68%	98.86%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
11,783	11,700	98.86%	100%	99.30%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	83

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Resaon for Delay	Number of Cases
Child's hospitalization/ long-term illness	1
Natural disaster	4
No valid reason	78
Total	83
Range of days beyond 60 day timeline	61-116

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- (●) **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**
- ( ) **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations?

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ( ) **State monitoring**
- (●) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Reported data were generated from Iowa's Information Management System. The data reflect all children and youth in Iowa who were evaluated for

determination of eligibility for an IEP, during the current reporting period. The data were entered into the database by trained personnel, using the federal definition for 60-day timeline for evaluation (initial evaluations). The data taken from the monitoring system are based on actual (not an average) number of days.

Iowa uses the date of receipt of consent by the public agency, as the date for starting the 60-day calendar for completion of the evaluation. The State uses date of evaluation as the date for stopping the calendar for calculating the timeline. At all pertinent times, Iowa's definition of 60-day timeline is identical to the federal definition contained in the 2005 IDEA amendments and the 2007 IDEA regulations.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
124	124	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State uses data from the state database designed to track special education evaluation and placement data. These data are used to determine the extent to which 60-day timelines are being met statewide, and which AEAs are or are not meeting the 60-day timeline. The State continues to emphasize on the use of verification reports to help meet the timelines.

AEAs below 95 percent compliance are required to write a corrective action plan (CAP) to correct systemic compliance issues. Iowa would like to clarify that the threshold of 95 percent is used only to determine which AEAs are required to write corrective action plans, not to determine noncompliance. Any noncompliance issue falling below 100 percent is cited, corrected, and verified. The State ensures that steps in the corrective action plan are completed by monitoring implementation of the CAP through Iowa's ISTAR system, assigning personnel to monitor implementation of the CAP, and by verifying implementation through data. All AEAs were above 95 percent compliance for both the current and prior reporting period.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Iowa verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that every child for whom consent to evaluate was received subsequently received an evaluation, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, and (b) verifying that each LEA that was performing below 100 percent compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).
Verification of correction of individual noncompliance (Prong 1) occurs in the ISTAR system and state data system in two ways. First, the AEA verifies that for each child for whom the timeline was exceeded, an evaluation was conducted and an IEP was developed with appropriate services, if eligible. Then the State verifies the same information on the IEP and in the statewide data system. Child-specific noncompliance is considered "verified" when both steps have been completed. Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement (Prong 2) is done by analyzing updated data in a sample from the state's data system subsequent to the period during which the noncompliance was found, but within the one-year correction period. To be determined to be correctly implementing the regulatory requirement, an LEA is required to meet 100 percent compliance in a sample of three new evaluations. The time period examined begins six months from notification of findings of noncompliance and ends three months later.
While Iowa was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for prior reporting period, the State has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the State with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the Department of Justice or state auditor. [IAC 281–41.604]

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		99.83%	80.50%	88.12%	95.39%	99.57%	99.75%	98.88%	99.63%	97.66%	98.07%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,031
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	36
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	905
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	7
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	77

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	905	911	98.07%	100%	99.34%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	6

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Reason for Delay	Number of Cases
No valid reason	6
Total	6
Range of days beyond thrid birthday	1-41

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ○ **State monitoring**
- ◉ **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data reported were generated from Iowa's Information Management System. The data reflect all children in Iowa who were referred by Part C prior to age three for determination of eligibility for an IEP, during the current reporting period. The data were entered into the database by trained personnel.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State uses data from the state database tracking special education evaluation and placement data to determine the extent to which early childhood transition requirements are being met in the state, and to determine which AEAs are and are not meeting those requirements. During the prior reporting period, the State determined that noncompliance was occurring FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)7/6/2015Page 45 of 72 rarely and in isolated cases without any trend. As a result of the root cause analyses, the SEA continued to promote the use of verification reports in the state's database that alert AEAs to transition requirements.

AEAs below 95 percent compliance are required to write a corrective action plan (CAP) to correct systemic compliance issues. Iowa would like to clarify that the threshold of 95 percent is used only to determine which AEAs are required to write corrective action plans, not to determine noncompliance. Any noncompliance issue falling below 100 percent is cited, corrected, and verified. The State ensures that steps in the corrective action plan are completed by monitoring implementation of the CAP through Iowa's ISTAR system, assigning personnel to monitor implementation of the CAP, and by verifying implementation through data. All AEAs were above 95 percent compliance for both the current and prior reporting period.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Iowa verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that very child served in Part C and referred to Part B subsequently received an evaluation and – if eligible – a fully developed IEP, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, and (b) verifying that each LEA that was performing below 100 percent compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b). Verification of correction of individual noncompliance (Prong 1) occurs in the ISTAR system and state data system in two ways. First, the AEA verifies that for each child for whom the timeline was exceeded, an evaluation was conducted and an IEP was developed with appropriate services, if eligible. Then the State verifies the same information on the IEP and in the statewide data system. Child-specific noncompliance is considered "verified" when both steps have been completed. Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement (Prong 2) is done by analyzing updated data in a sample from the state's data system subsequent to the period during which the noncompliance was found but within the one year correction period. To be determined to be correctly implementing the regulatory requirement, an LEA is required to meet 100 percent compliance in a sample of three new evaluations. The time period examined begins six months from notification of findings of noncompliance and ends three months later.

While Iowa was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for the prior reporting period, the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the SEA with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the department of justice or state auditor. [IAC 41.604]

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						66.48%	69.09%	65.80%	68.21%	85.21%	87.56%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4,931	5,205	87.56%	100%	94.74%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- (•) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

In order to obtain the sample for the current reporting year, IEPs were randomly selected at the district level from the population of students with disabilities ages 14 and older in districts in the self-assessment year of Iowa's school improvement cycle. (Please note that Iowa Code requires that transition planning begin by age 14, rather than age 16, as stipulated by IDEA.) Sample size was determined using a 95 percent confidence interval with a margin of error of +/-10 percent. The sample was drawn with stringent confidence intervals because of the magnitude of decision-making based on the data.

The sample was drawn from districts according to the self-assessment year within Iowa's school improvement cycle. The improvement cycle ensures that every district is reviewed once every five years.

Data collection team members received training and passed three reliability checks with at least 75 percent accuracy prior to data collection. A response rate of 100 percent was achieved. To meet criteria for Indicator B-13, an IEP must contain all six of the elements listed below.

Critical Element 1: Interests and Preferences. Interests and preferences as they relate to post-secondary areas and student invitation to the meeting.

Critical Element 2: Transition Assessments. Assessment information listing specific data and the source of the data for each post-secondary area of living, learning and working is sufficient to determine that the post-secondary area was assessed.

Critical Element 3: Post-secondary Expectations. A statement for each post-secondary area of living, learning, and working is observable, based on assessment information and projects beyond high school.

Critical Element 4: Course of Study. The course of study must project to the student's anticipated end of high school, be based on needs and include: 1) a targeted graduation date; 2) the student's graduation criteria; and 3) any courses or activities the student needs to pursue his/her post-secondary expectations.

Critical Element 5: Annual Goals. All goals must support pursuit of the student's post-secondary expectations and be well-written and all areas of post-secondary expectations must have a goal or service / activity or the assessment information must clearly indicate there is no need for services in that post-secondary area.

Critical Element 6: Services, supports, and activities. Statements must specifically describe the services, supports and activities necessary to meet the needs identified through the transition assessment. Evidence that adult agencies and community organizations were involved as appropriate must also be present.

Data were collected through Iowa's System to Achieve Results (ISTAR), certified by AEA staff and validated through the ISTAR system. Selection bias was avoided to the largest possible extent by drawing a representative sample of IEPs at a high level of confidence and conducting the analysis only after weighting the data properly.

Sample data for reporting period were assessed for similarity or difference of the sample to the population of students with disabilities. Results of this assessment are provided in the attached document titled B13 Representativeness. (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category.)

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
249	249	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State uses data from the states monitoring database to track information on compliance with secondary transition requirements. These data are used to determine the extent to which transition requirements are being met statewide, and which AEAs are or are not correctly implementing the requirements. AEAs below 95 percent compliance are required to write a corrective action plan (CAP) to correct systemic compliance issues. Iowa would like to clarify that the threshold of 95 percent is used only to determine which AEAs are required to write corrective action plans, not to determine noncompliance. Any noncompliance issue falling below 100 percent is cited, corrected, and verified. Based on data for the current reporting period, seven AEAs will be required to write a corrective action plan. The State ensures that steps in the corrective action plan are completed by monitoring implementation of the CAP through Iowa's ISTAR system, assigning State personnel to monitor implementation of the CAP, and by verifying implementation through data.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Iowa verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that every instance of child-specific noncompliance was subsequently corrected on the IEP, and (b) verifying that each LEA that was performing below 100% compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Verification of correction of individual noncompliance (Prong 1) occurs in the ISTAR monitoring system. First, the district verifies that for each child for whom the transition requirements were not met, all required corrections have been made on the IEP. Then the AEA verifies the same information on the IEP. Child-specific noncompliance is considered "verified" when both steps have been completed. Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement (Prong 2) is done by analyzing updated data in a sample of IEPs subsequent to the time during which the noncompliance was found, but within the one-year correction period. To be determined to be correctly implementing the regulatory requirement, an district or AEA is required to meet 100% compliance in a sample of three new transition file reviews. The time period examined begins six months from notification of findings of noncompliance and ends three months later. While Iowa was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for prior reporting period, the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the State with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the Department of Justice or state auditor. [IAC 2 1 1.604]

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

A. **Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
B. **Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
C. **Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2008	Target ≥						28.20%	32.20%	34.70%	38.70%	40.00%	42.00%
		Data					25.70%	34.09%	72.79%	83.17%	39.95%	33.51%	30.71%
B	2008	Target ≥						49.65%	53.65%	57.65%	61.65%	62.00%	64.00%
		Data					48.65%	53.03%	90.62%	92.26%	66.26%	59.15%	58.57%
C	2008	Target ≥						85.14%	86.14%	87.14%	88.14%	89.00%	90.00%
		Data					84.14%	83.99%	100%	100%	93.17%	78.74%	83.14%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%
Target B ≥	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%	72.00%
Target C ≥	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa Department of Education staff developed targets for performance indicators using available data and knowledge of current practices. Proposed targets and rational were presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for approval.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	668.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	190.12
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	170.17
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	65.18
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	172.09

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	190.12	668.00	30.71%	44.00%	28.46%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	360.29	668.00	58.57%	66.00%	53.94%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	597.56	668.00	83.14%	91.00%	89.46%

Explanation of A Slippage

Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for Indicator 14A for the current reporting period. The percentage of students enrolled in higher education decreased from 30.71 to 28.46 percent. The State attributes the slippage to annual fluctuations in the data.

Explanation of B Slippage

Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for Indicator 14B for the current reporting period. The percentage of students enrolled in higher education decreased from 58.57 to 53.94 percent. The State attributes the slippage to annual fluctuations in the data.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

District sampling procedures. Districts collect Part B Indicator 14 data as part of Iowa's compliance monitoring cycle, which begins with the submission of a Comprehensive School Improvement Plan in Year 1 and culminates with a site visit in Year 5. Each of Iowa's 346 districts is required to address all components of the compliance cycle within a five-year period. Indicator B14 data are collected in Year 4 of the compliance cycle through the administration of the one-year follow-up survey. Districts are required to participate in the One Year Follow-up Interview. District participation in training activities is reviewed and non-participants are contacted. Districts that still refuse to participate will be cited for noncompliance during their school improvement visit. To ensure a balanced representation of the State across each year of the 5-Year cycle, the Department of Education hired Dr. Michael Larsen as an advisor. Dr. Larsen has a doctorate in statistics from Harvard University and is a professor in statistics at Iowa State University. He has worked at Stanford University, Gallup, The U.S. Bureau of Census and the University of Chicago and is eminently qualified to advise the Department. Dr. Larsen's analysis of district assignments to the school improvement schedule indicated that the overall State representation is balanced across the years. However, slight adjustments in districts' assigned years would improve distributions across the years for comparisons within an area education agency (AEA). Dr. Larsen also advised that weighting procedures done in analysis could also remedy the slight imbalance for an AEA analysis across years. Weighting the results will also allow for a representative sample across Iowa including race / ethnicity and gender. The Department of Education decided to maintain the district assigned schedule and account for imbalances in the weighted analysis within AEAs. State results will also be adjusted using weighting and aggregation across years since there is not a probability sample using the established school improvement cycle. Student sampling procedures. Data were collected from two groups of former students: those who had IEPs in high school and those who did not have IEPs in high school. Sample selection procedures were established so that district data are representative of the districts and can be used for district improvement. Sample size was determined based on a 95% confidence interval with a margin of error of not more than 0.05. All students in the class who had IEPs were selected for the district's sample. Districts with more than one high school (n=8 districts) were sampled at the high school level. Sampling of students occurred if the group (IEP, or no IEP) had 70 or more students. If the district had less than 70 students in a group, all students were selected for participation. Instrumentation. The One-Year follow-up survey consisted of 35 questions regarding participant perceptions of high school, employment status, living arrangements, and postsecondary enrollment status. The survey instrument was developed from a synthesis of published research. (Bruininks, Lewis, & Thurlow, 1988; Hasazi, Gordon, & Roe, 1985; Kortering & Edgar, 1988; Mithaug, Horiuchi, & Fanning, 1985; Sitlington & Frank, 1990; Wehman, Kergel, & Seyfarth, 1985; Wagner, 1993.) Procedures. The One-Year follow-up survey is administered in Year 4 of the Compliance Monitoring Cycle. It is conducted through a phone interview with the former student or their family member. Persons conducting the interview are districtdesignated personnel who have been trained to collect the information. Treatment of non-respondents. Several procedures have been established to minimize the number of non-respondents. First, seniors are asked to provide names and phone numbers where they might be reached one year after high school. Second, districts are instructed to make three attempts to contact individuals. Finally, districts are provided incentive funds for the number of interviews they complete. Currently, they receive a flat rate per interview. Analysis of data. Data were collected via Iowa's System to Achieve Results (ISTAR), the state's web-based monitoring database, and submitted to the SEA, where they were validated. Missing data and outliers were flagged and verified. Response data for the survey were weighted appropriately by district size to correct for the exclusion of some districts from the sample during each year of the Compliance Monitoring Cycle. Selection bias was avoided to the largest possible extent by drawing a representative sample of participants at a high level of confidence and conducting the analysis only after weighting the data properly. Sample data for reporting period were assessed for similarity or difference of the sample to the population of students with disabilities exiting school. Results of this assessment are provided in the attached document titled B14 Representativeness.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data		100%	50.00%	100%	75.00%			50.00%	100%	25.00%	50.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs instructs that the State is not required to provide baseline or targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held. Iowa will, therefore, not be reporting baseline or targets for the current reporting period.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
3	4	50.00%		75.00%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			92.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data		74.00%	90.00%	88.89%	75.00%	76.19%	83.33%	64.00%	100%	81.82%	85.71%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa Department of Education staff developed targets for performance indicators using available data and knowledge of current practices. Proposed targets and rational were presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for approval.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	5	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	8	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	17	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
5	8	17	85.71%	75.00%	76.47%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target ≥		26.00%	30.00%
Data	25.38%	33.78%	18.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	34.00%	38.00%	42.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

Proficiency rate percent = ([(# of children with IEPs in third grade scoring at or above benchmark on a valid and reliable screening assessment, based on the assessment criterion cut point) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs in third grade who took the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST) is the valid and reliable screening assessment that Iowa will use to set and achieve targets. FAST is a suite of assessments. For the purposes of statewide improvement of Specially Designed Instruction, Iowa will be monitoring growth using the adaptive Reading (aReading) measure. This measure is administered as early as the winter of kindergarten and through high school. It is a computer-adapted test that allows for the individualization of the assessment based on student skills. Therefore, if a third grader is reading two years below grade level, the test will pinpoint skills at that level. Additionally, because FAST aReading is administered via computer, accommodations are readily available for learners who need them. Reliability and validity data for FAST aReading indicate that it is highly predictive of reading outcomes and results are correlated with other standardized reading assessments. Additionally, reliability and validity in administration and scoring of the assessment is assured via built in online training, practice, and certification on both administration and scoring components of the assessments.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Iowa's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is the product of many contributors including parents, individuals with disabilities, teachers, principals, local directors of special education, area education agency (AEA) content consultants, area education agency (AEA) directors of special education, Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), IHEs and Iowa Department of Department of Education (DOE) staff including special education, Title I, and school improvement consultants. Involvement of these participants took many forms and, to the extent possible, was incorporated through existing groups and activities rather than as an extraneous activity.

Primary conceptualization, review of data, sorting of small-group input and making of recommendations was accomplished by Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). Iowa's SEAP has thirty-one members and includes representation from individuals with disabilities, parents of learners with disabilities, special educators, district special education administrators, area education agency special education directors, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center, Disability Rights Iowa, institutes of higher education and state agencies including juvenile justice, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Iowa Department of Human Services, and Iowa Department for the Blind. This group is extremely inclusive and collaborative, as evidenced by its rotating leadership. The current chair of SEAP is a Work Experience Coordinator from a small rural district and next year's chair is an instructional coach for a large Iowa district. Recent past chairs have been the director of Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) and a parent of an adolescent with a disability.

Each component of Phase 1 of the SSIP (i.e., 1. Data Analysis, 2. Selection of the State Identified Measureable Result, 3. Analysis of State Infrastructure, 4. Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies, and 5. Theory of Action) began with SEAP's conceptualization of the activities needed to accomplish the component. As activities were completed, information was brought back to SEAP for discussion, refinement and consideration for SSIP recommendations.

Input on all SEAP recommendations was sought from the AEA Directors of Special Education and the Department of Education Special Education Team. This input was then considered by a DOE internal SSIP team for a final decision on the SSIP component. The internal DOE SSIP team included the Chief of the Bureau of Learning Supports and Strategies, the Chief of the School Improvement Bureau, the State Director of Special Education, Iowa's Part C Coordinator, Parts C and B Data Coordinators, Iowa's 619 Coordinator, and administrative leadership for Early Childhood. All recommendations made by SEAP were used to form Iowa's SSIP.

Targets were proposed by an internal team of DOE consultants with expertise in literacy. Their recommendations were shared with several statewide groups including the State Literacy Team (representing school districts, AEAs, and the DE), a state task team working on intensive literacy strategies (representatives of LEA general education, AEA general and special education literacy consultants, DOE literacy consultants, DOE school psychologists) and the AEA directors of special education. Targets were set to be rigorous and achievable given the average growth seen in Iowa and nationally.

Iowa's targets for the SSIP were determined using knowledge of results obtained on NAEP over the last twenty years, current educational initiatives in Iowa that are likely to influence the performance of students with disabilities, current data on student performance, and input from stakeholders. In a recent analysis of NAEP standard scores in 4th grade reading for all students conducted by Dan Reschly, the median national change over the twenty year period from 1992-2013 was +6 standard score points. Iowa's change over the same time period was -2 standard score points. The best performing state during this time period – Maryland – gained 21 points.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

SEAP began the formal process for developing Iowa's SSIP in Fall, 2013 by changing the conversations around SPP/APR Indicators. Instead of separately reviewing the target for each indicator, the indicators were clustered within the broad goals of the Iowa Department of Education. Deep discussion was held to identify the extent to which learners who receive special education services achieve the following desired results:
Enter kindergarten ready to learn to read.

Are proficient readers by the end of 3rd grade.

Progress at a rate that ensures success across core content areas.

Are engaged in school and community.

Graduate from high school.

Are college and career ready.

Rich conversations were held for each of these goals, beginning with a review of existing data. SEAP members identified those data that seemed most compelling and data that were not relevant or strong enough to form the basis of decisions. Discussion also identified those areas with activities and strategies linked to infrastructure support and those areas that were lacking. DOE staff with assignments relevant to each result area contributed to discussions specific to their topical expertise. This year-long conversation resulted in narrowing the identification of a measureable result to two potential areas: 1. Proficient readers by the end of 3rd grade and 2. Graduate from high school ready for college and career.

These two areas were then presented to a number of small groups to get their preferences and insights. These small groups included: AEA special education directors, Urban Education Network Special Education Directors, and DOE Special Education Team members. While all found graduation from high school ready for college and career compelling, most felt that the state was better poised for deeper data analysis and infrastructure support to ensure learners with disabilities are proficient readers by the end of 3rd grade. SEAP members reviewed this input and their previous analysis in each of the six goals and thus, Iowa's identified measureable result is that all learners who received special education services will be proficient readers by the end of 3rd grade. Once this result area was selected, deeper data analysis occurred in two primary areas: 1. Proficiency and growth on statewide reading assessments and 2. Proficiency on state universal screeners for reading. The remainder of this section describes activities related to both of these areas of analysis.

Analysis of proficiency and growth on state reading assessments. Further analysis of the proficiency and growth on state reading assessments was completed by a state-wide group with broad data experience. The state data group included an AEA special education director, school psychologists, school improvement consultant, assessment consultant, a DOE administrative consultant for education data and the state director of special education. This group focused on identification of a growth model and examined data related to growth on statewide proficiency assessments. The group decided to use the same growth model proposed by the Attendance Center Rankings Committee which was established as a result of state legislation. This growth indicator is based primarily on a college and career ready target and trajectory. Using this model, an individual growth goal is generated for each student based on their last year and current year Iowa National Standard Score. If the student is already above the trajectory, the growth goal will be the annual increase in normative or observed growth at the 50th percentile for the student's current grade. For those students below the trajectory, their growth goal will mean learning more than a year's set of information. Data from the 2013-14 state assessments grades 3-8 and 11 were disaggregated at the building level, district level, and AEA level. They were also disaggregated at the state level according to percent time spent in general education environment. The information gathered by this group was shared with the AEA directors of special education, along with preliminary findings, including:

- Statewide, 69% of students with IEPS also received Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL). Distribution in LEAs and AEAs varied greatly.
- There was no significant difference in reading proficiency or reading progress between those students who had an IEP and those students who had an IEP and received a free and reduced lunch.
- Although a gap exists between the percentage of students without IEPs who make progress and those with IEPs who make progress, it is considerably less than the reading proficiency gap (e.g., gap of 13.75% for those who made progress between 2012-13 and 2013-14 versus a 42.34% gap in reading proficiency in 2013-14).
- Reading proficiency was not a significant factor in students with IEPs meeting individual growth trajectories. For example, between the 2012-13 school year and the 2013-14 school year, 43.24% of IEP students who were proficient met their growth trajectories. During this same time period, 41.21% of IEP students who were not proficient met their growth trajectories.
- Preliminary review of LRE data and percentage of students meeting their growth trajectories suggested no probable statistical difference when aggregated at the state level. District level analyses, however, suggested variance across districts and across buildings within districts.

After reviewing these data, the AEA directors of special education supported the use of the growth model but suggested refraining from using the data as a system measure until a later date. Specifically, the AEA Directors encouraged further statewide understanding of the growth model and deeper understanding of its implications before using it as a means of measuring system (i.e., state, AEA, LEA or building level) progress.

Analysis of state universal screening data for reading. Iowa's newly enacted Early Literacy Progression Law (Iowa Code §279.68 and IAC 281—62) requires all schools in the state to implement universal early literacy screening assessments three times each year across all students, in kindergarten through third grade. This requirement is designed for early identification and intervention for at-risk readers, including learners with disabilities. Several universal screening tools were approved for schools to use and the DOE purchased one of them and then developed a database to support data analysis. Ninety-one percent of Iowa's elementary buildings elected to use the assessments and accompanying database in the 2014-2015 school year. The assessments used are the Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST). FAST is a suite of assessments. For the purposes of statewide improvement of Specially Designed Instruction, Iowa will be monitoring growth using the adaptive Reading (aReading) measure. This measure is administered as early as the winter of Kindergarten and through high school. It is a computer-adapted test that allows for the individualization of the assessment based on student skills. Therefore, if a third grader is reading two years below grade level, the test will pinpoint skills at that level. Additionally, because FAST aReading is administered via computer, accommodations are readily available for learners who need them. Reliability and validity data for FAST aReading indicate that it is highly predictive of reading outcomes and results are correlated with other standardized reading assessments. Additionally, reliability and validity in administration and scoring of the assessment is assured via built in online training, practice, and certification on both administration and scoring components of the assessments.

Iowa TIER is the department's data system for student universal screening, intervention, and progress monitoring data. In this environment, educators can administer online universal screening and progress monitoring assessments and receive results back instantly. They can create customized intervention banks and individualized interventions, schedule students into interventions and monitor their progress. It is also possible to set multiple goals, individualized for each student and easily view teachers' daily and weekly schedules related to assessment and intervention.

The universal screening data were analyzed by a small group of people with expertise in literacy and specially designed instruction. DOE consultants with expertise in literacy completed an initial analysis and then had external groups with expertise in literacy review the preliminary findings. External reviewers included representatives of the Iowa Reading Research Center, Collaborating for Kids (C4K), and Iowa's Statewide Reading Team. Their findings were reviewed by SEAP and are described below.

Research suggests that individuals with IEPs perform better when their peers without disabilities also perform well. Iowa's data follow this trend. For instance, Table 1 depicts the number of buildings that fall into various proficiency levels. No buildings had at least 60% of learners with IEPs meeting benchmarks if the building did not have at least 60% of learners without IEPs meeting benchmarks. Deeper analysis of the data, however, indicated that proficiency of peers is not sufficient for identifying buildings in need of support. Although 90% of participating elementary buildings had 60% of their third graders scoring at proficient or higher benchmarks, only 10% of all participating elementary buildings had 60% of third graders with IEPS scoring at proficient or higher on benchmarks (see Table 1). Indeed, of the 203 schools with 60% of students meeting benchmarks, 65.9% had less than 39% of students with IEPs who met benchmarks. Most surprising to review groups was that 91 schools had 0% of students with IEPs proficient.

Table 1. Number of Elementary Buildings with Percentage of Third Graders Meeting Benchmarks on Administration of Winter 2015 Universal Screeners

% of 3rd Graders without IEPS Meeting Benchmarks	% of 3rd Graders with IEPs Meeting Benchmarks					
	0%	1-39%	40-59%	60-79%	80-100%	Total
1-39%	2	0	1	0	0	3
40-59%	10	16	0	0	0	26
60-79%	51	71	18	5	4	149
80-100%	28	53	28	15	6	130
Total Number of Schools	91	140	47	20	10	308

Analysis of the first screening indicated that smaller percentages of students on IEPs met assessment targets than did their peers without disabilities (see Table 2). In kindergarten and first grade, it was found that both alphabetic principle and phonemic awareness were areas of high need. In second through sixth grade, both rate and accuracy were of concern. This suggests that learners with IEPs need to be explicitly taught skills related

to alphabetic principle and decoding. Due to the consistency of these data across grade levels, these skill needs should be the first priority of support provided to Iowa teachers related to matching instructional focus to student needs.

Table 2. Results of the Fall 2014 Universal Screening Assessments in Literacy

Grade	Assessment	% of All Students Meeting Targets	% of Students with IEPs Meeting Targets
K	Composite	54%	27%
	Concepts of Print	61%	39%
	Letter Names	51%	31%
	Onset Sounds	62%	32%
	Letter Sounds	43%	26%
1	Composite	63%	32%
	Sight Words	64%	35%
	Word Segmenting	76%	47%
	Nonsense Words	83%	55%
	Sentence Reading	50%	23%
2	CBM-R Rate	63%	26%
	CBM-R Accuracy	56%	21%
3	CBM-R Rate	63%	22%
	CBM-R Accuracy	74%	34%
4	CBM-R Rate	47%	14%
	CBM-R Accuracy	89%	57%
5	CBM-R Rate	64%	21%
	CBM-R Accuracy	94%	75%
6	CBM-R Rate	55%	11%
	CBM-R Accuracy	94%	73%

Summary of data analysis. Through data analysis, Iowa identified two new measures for deeper understanding of the extent to which Iowa learners with disabilities are proficient readers by the end of third grade: growth on statewide assessments and percent of learners meeting benchmarks on universal literacy screeners. Analysis of these data indicate that Iowa learners with disabilities struggle to become proficient readers by the end of third grade, regardless of geographic location, free and reduced lunch participation and comparison to peers meeting benchmarks. Deeper analysis of the universal screening data indicated that learners with IEPs need to be explicitly taught skills related to alphabetic principle and decoding. Overwhelmingly, participants in the data analysis groups recommended using the universal screening data to set targets and measure progress while continuing to develop use of the growth model.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Process for Analysis of Capacity of Current Infrastructure

Iowa used a multi-level approach to analyze the state's infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity. A broad analysis of system capacity occurred as SEAP members analyzed data in each of the six goal areas reviewed for selection of Iowa's state identified measureable result (SIMR). These six areas were:

1. Enter kindergarten ready to learn to read.
2. Are proficient readers by the end of 3rd grade.
3. Progress at a rate that ensures success across core content areas.
4. Are engaged in school and community.
5. Graduate from high school.
6. Are college and career ready.

As SEAP members discussed data related to each goal, they also discussed current activities directed toward improving outcomes in each goal area. DOE staff and those external agency staff engaged in related activities (e.g., Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services) discussed the infrastructure available to support current activities with SEAP. These discussions revealed which areas of need had activities likely to achieve results, areas which did not have activities and most importantly, the extent to which the state was ready to implement, scale-up, and sustain evidence-based practices to achieve the desired results. Once discussions had occurred for each of the six goals, SEAP members reviewed their findings to select a state identified measureable result. This expansive review of existing state infrastructure led SEAP to recommend the state identify all learners who received special education services be proficient readers by the end of 3rd grade as Iowa's targeted measureable result. The goal to graduate ready for college and career was not recommended because the analysis revealed less infrastructure support in this area.

Selection of Iowa's state identified measureable result (SIMR) permitted participants to move from across-the-board analysis of state infrastructure to a scrutiny of state supports to improve literacy. This was completed by examining existing information and collecting new information from parents, special educators, school administrators, AEA consultants, AEA administrators, state agency staff and DOE staff. The examination of existing information is described below in *Overview of Iowa's Infrastructure Systems* . Additional information was gathered from focus group conversations with over 150 representatives of parents, special education teachers, general education teachers, local special and general education administrators, Area Education Agency (AEA) consultants, AEA special education administrators, institutions of higher education, other state agencies and Department of Education Special Education staff. Results of these conversations are included in *Results of Infrastructure Analysis* and *Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies.*

Overview of Iowa's Infrastructure Systems

Three components of Iowa's infrastructure have a direct impact on Iowa's identified measureable result that all learners who received special education services be proficient readers by the end of third grade: 1. Internal Department of Education organizational structures, resources and supports; 2. Partnerships with Iowa Area Education Agencies, especially the Collaborating for Iowa Kids (C4K) framework, and 3. Teacher Leadership Compensation legislation. This section provides an overview of each of these three components. Findings on the analysis of these areas is provided in Results of Infrastructure Analysis.

1. Internal Department of Education Organizational Structure. Since 2012 the Iowa Department of Education has experienced significant changes in leadership. The Division of Learning and Results, in which the Bureau of Special Education was housed, experienced 92% of its leadership as new to, or in new roles within, the DOE. During this transformative year, the newly appointed Division Administrator convened a twenty-six member team to address internal infrastructure challenges. The charge was put forth by the Division Administrator: Design a Division system that works more efficiently and effectively with improved results for children and youth. This team met over the course of approximately 3 months, dedicating time and effort to change Division culture, focus and outcomes. The Division of Learning and Results has been reorganized into five new bureaus: Bureau of Learner Strategies and Supports; Bureau of School Improvement; Bureau of Educator Quality; Bureau of Information and Analysis Services; and Bureau of Standards and Curriculum. Staff were assigned to bureaus based on their function, not their funding source. In 2013 a new Director of Special Education was hired. Also in 2013, a new Director of the Department of Education was appointed. Unfortunately, the director has recently announced he will leave the Department in June, 2015.

In the DOE reorganization, special education became a team with members assigned to four of the bureaus. The Special Education Team, led by the State Director of Special Education consists of approximately 45 consultants and support staff. The Director of Special Education and the Part C Coordinator sit within the Bureau of Learner Supports and Strategies along with ten consultants with Part B program specific responsibilities (e.g., autism, secondary transition). Other members of this bureau include consultants with assignments related to Part C, PBIS and mental health. The Bureau of School Improvement Bureau houses special education staff with data, monitoring and compliance responsibilities. Other members of this bureau include consultants responsible for Title I, Equity, and LEA and AEA accreditation. The Bureau of Educator Quality houses special education consultants working with para-educator and teacher training as well as other consultants with work related to teacher and administrator training. Finally, the Bureau of Standards and Curriculum includes the 619 Coordinator, special education consultants with expertise related to assessments and curriculum and other consultants with responsibilities for assessment, math, literacy and Iowa Early Learning Standards and Iowa Core.

2. Partnership with Iowa's Area Education Agencies . The DOE's abilities to reach local education districts are a direct result of its partnerships with Area Education Agencies (AEAs). Since 1974, each Iowa district has received support from an AEA to provide specialized services and equity in the provision of programs and services across the state. The AEAs carry special education general supervision and compliance responsibilities and the charge to provide the services needed by the local school districts. Their primary role has been provision of special education support services to individuals under the age of 21 years requiring special education and related services, media services to all children through grade 12, and other educational services to pupils and education staff. The AEAs also define the system used to locate and identify students suspected of having disabilities and provide the personnel to conduct evaluation activities in collaboration with LEAs.

During the 2012-2013 year, the Iowa Department of Education realized that, although powerful, internal reorganization is not sufficient to transform Iowa's educational system toward optimal positive outcomes for students. To this end, administration investigated the possibility of greater participation in promising work originating across Iowa's Area Education Agencies - Collaborating for Iowa's Kids (C4K). C4K was established in 2011-12 as a vehicle to coordinate the AEA system – and then the AEA/DE system- toward greater efficiency. Though the DOE were members of C4K in its 2011-12 inaugural year, participation was variable at best. In the 2012-2013 year as the DOE sought to support effective statewide infrastructure, DOE participation in C4K rose from approximately 5 administrative personnel to over 40 personnel. As the educational system began to coalesce, C4K collectively found a need to identify its goal, priority areas, governance structure, intent and theory of action to support statewide work. To this end, significant work and study was completed.

To identify an initial C4K goal, groups reviewed Iowa testing data, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data to understand the highest area of need as a state. The group celebrated that, with a student enrollment in 2013-2014 of 510,525 in 346 districts (Iowa Department of Education, 2015), Iowa has an 89.7% graduation rate and a dropout rate of 1.92%– rates that are among the best in the nation. However, after reviewing data across reading, mathematics and science, it became increasingly clear that over the course of nearly 10 years, Iowa has not only failed to increase 4th grade student reading performance; there has been a slight decrease in the skills of Iowa children (Scale score at 225 in 1992; Scale score of 224 in 2013, National Assessment of Educational Performance). Nationally Iowa slipped from 5th in the nation in student performance in reading, to 25th in just under 12 years. Data based on Iowa tests indicate a gap between students with IEPs: 29.9% proficient, and Non-IEP students at 78.05% proficient. English Language Learners fair a little better at 35.55% proficiency as compared to 73.29% proficiency of all students [Iowa testing 2012]. These data clarified the initial goal in C4K: *Every child is proficient in reading by the end of third grade.*

To identify C4K priority areas, groups reviewed The McKinsey Study (2011). The McKinsey Study includes an analysis of 20 systems from around the world, all with improving but differing levels of performance, examining how each has achieved significant, sustained, and widespread gains in student outcomes, as measured by international and national assessments. The authors sought to understand which elements were specific to the individual system and which were of broader or universal relevance. Based on their database of nearly 575 interventions mapped across 20 sample systems, they indicated there are six interventions that occur with equal frequency across all systems, but are manifested differently in each improvement journey stage:

Revising curriculum and standard

From this, C4K established a focus on Standards & Curriculum or Iowa's Early Learning Standards for PK students and the Iowa Core for students K-12 th grade.

Reviewing reward and remunerations structure

C4K did not establish a priority area to address rewards and remunerations, however they did pledge to coordinate directly with the IDE established Teacher Leadership and Compensation policy and program.

Building technical skills of teachers and principals, often through group or cascaded training

From this, C4K established a focus on Educator Quality, and expanded this focus by Summer 2013 to include Professional Learning.

Assessing student learning and using student data to guide delivery

From this, C4K established a focus on an Early Warning System[1] that was subsequently enveloped into the work of the priority area of Multi-Tiered System of Supports[2]

Establishing policy documents and education laws

From this, C4K established a focus on School Improvement.

To establish C4K governance structure, groups reviewed National Implementation Research Network (NIRN)/Dean Fixsen's work (c.f. Blase & Fixsen, 2013). C4K determined that a new way of working together required a new structure for planning, implementing and sustaining work that can collectively accomplish the goal that every child is proficient by the end of third grade. To this end, we developed a working Governance Structure, based on Fixsen's work in implementation science, with the intent to support more efficient use of work groups and resources. Briefly, in any work, it is critical to establish groups of people to attend to specific functions necessary to move work forward within a system:

People who are able to lead across the system who are able to make decisions about resources and policies: Collaborative (C4K) Oversight. Essentially, this is a decision-making group with membership that includes the DE Division Administrator and Associate Division Administrator, AEA Chiefs and Directors, LEA Superintendents and the Co-Chairs of Work Coordination.

People who are able to coordinate work across the system to ensure coherency and alignment of work, programs, products and training/coaching: Work Coordination. Members include system facilitators, one each from the DE, AEA and LEA, and facilitators from each of the Work Teams.

People who are experts in identified areas within the state's priority focus to identify/develop evidence-based frameworks, practices, strategies, programs and supports: Work Teams. Members across the six teams below include experts regardless of agency or location (e.g., personnel at universities, national organizations, schools, AEA, DE, etc.). Please see Figure 1 for a list of work teams, purpose and major work they are charged to complete.

People who are able to provide critical input and advice on major proposals and decisions for the state: Advisory. Members include stakeholders within and outside of the educational system.

People who are able to scale/implement across Iowa with fidelity: Implementation. This group is often called C4K or The Collaborative. Members include DE, AEA and LEA personnel.

People who are able to develop essential communications across audiences: Communication. Members include AEA and DE communication specialists.

People who are the first to apply the "what" (developed by the Work Teams) using the how (scaling/implementation developed and monitored by the Implementation group) to meet the goal that every child is proficient by the end of third grade: Partner schools.

Figure 1. Work Teams, Purpose and Major Work.

School Improvement: This statewide work team is focused on ensuring regulatory responsibilities set forth in state and federal law and rule are used to position the DE, AEAs and LEAs and other agencies and programs to engage in continuous improvement. This includes the following:

- Implementation & Scaling: To identify and adopt an evidence-based scaling and implementation model for the state;
- Continuous Improvement process: To develop, implement and embed a new continuous improvement model for the state;
- Data System: To create a statewide data system to support MTSS, data-based decision-making and continuous improvement;
- Healthy Indicators: To identify key indicators of the educational system and embed this into continuous improvement;
- Differentiated Accountability: To join healthy indicators, continuous improvement and tiered accreditation into one group to meld all concepts together and vet the completed product across task groups to finalize continuous improvement for 2014-2015

Multi-Tiered System of Supports: This statewide work team is focused on ensuring every learner has the supports necessary to maximize benefits of instruction through evidence-based practices and supportive learning environments. This includes the following:

- Data-Based Decision-Making: To develop sequential steps, processes and tools for the collaborative inquiry questions;
- Early Warning System: To support identification of universal screening and progress monitoring measures,

and support implementation of universal screening and progress monitoring assessment in early literacy;
- o Instructional Strategy and Material Intensification: To identify evidence-based strategies and intervention programs;
- o Intensification of Instruction: To develop the processes and tools needed to work through Collaborative Inquiry Questions D6-10 for both targeted and intensive tiers;
- o Evidence-based MTSS implementation for Advanced Learners and ELL: To develop guidance for the system regarding how subgroups are served within MTSS

Iowa Core/Iowa Early Learning Standards [Standards & Curriculum]: This work team is focused on ensuring that high quality, rigorous standards are being taught, assessed, and learned in every classroom. This includes the following:
- o Strategies [intervention program group has sunset]: To develop materials and supports for core instruction at the universal tier;
- o CIQ D Questions: To develop tools to support collaborative inquiry within the universal tier of supports;
- o Inventory: To inventory materials and supports for core instruction at the universal tier grounded in the CIQ building blocks.

Educator Quality: This work team is focused on ensuring all educators have the skills, abilities and support to provide quality instruction and educational environments for all learners. This includes the following:
- o Collaborative Inquiry Questions: To develop a collaborative inquiry framework, manual and support system for educators;
- o Leadership Team: To develop a statewide network for administrator leaders to sustain Multi-Tiered System of Supports, educator learning and continuous improvement.

Professional Learning: This work team is focused on developing the professional learning structure and organization for training, and the support needed for sustainability within a statewide coach's network. This includes the following:
- o Training: To develop annual training calendar and work across teams to support development and implementation of training/professional learning;
- o Coaches Network: To develop a statewide network for instructional leaders, coaches and administrators to sustain educator learning and continuous improvement;
- o Phase One Supports: To identify and support needs of phase schools across implementation.

Evaluation: This work team is focused on developing and implementing evaluation of process, progress and outcomes across C4K and TLC. This includes the following:
- o Design for C4K and TLC: To develop the evaluation design for C4K and TLC;
- o Evaluate C4K and TLC: To implement the evaluation design for C4K and TLC.
- o School Implementation Tool: To identify and/or adapt implementation evaluation tools to implement at the school level

Based on the identified goal, priority areas and governance structure, C4K created a theory of action on behalf of the educational system:

If Iowa's educational system comes to consensus on a select number of high impact priorities and related drivers (Standards and Curriculum, MTSS, Educator Quality, Professional Learning, School Improvement and Evaluation);
and if we agree to establish the infrastructure necessary to effectively focus statewide efforts and implementation (Oversight, Work Coordination, Work Teams, State Implementation Team, Communication, Advisory);
and if there is consistent statewide implementation and support for scaling coordinated across priorities in critical areas (Leadership, Resources/Budgets, Communication, Fidelity/Evaluation, Professional Development, Evidenced-based Programs/Strategies);
and if we build the capacity of the educational system to provide sustained instructional coaching and support to educational personnel to implement priorities;
and if educational personnel implement priorities with fidelity;
and if there is an established evaluation plan focused on outcome impact and monitoring implementation to determine progress, development and next steps;
then educators will have the knowledge and skills they need to ensure the success of all learners and all learners are proficient readers by the end of 3rd grade (across subgroups).

Finally, C4K assimilated the data on literacy, research on key interventions, and what is collectively understood as the impact of illiteracy to identify the C4K intent (to work more effectively and efficiently as a full educational system to accomplish a few agreed upon priorities), goal (all students will be proficient in reading by the end of 3rd grade across subgroups), and priority areas (Standards & Curriculum, MTSS, Educator Quality, School Improvement, Professional Learning and Evaluation).

3. Teacher Leadership and Compensation System. The Iowa legislature has recognized that an external coaching model is insufficient to change practices, that research indicates that training plus coaching and data feedback result in a level of application of 95% (Joyce & Showers, 2002), and resources are needed to fully implement a successful leading and coaching infrastructure. To this end, the Iowa Legislature established the Teacher Leadership and Compensation System in 2013 as well as funding to support the new system. This legislation created a four-year process to develop a statewide teacher leadership and compensation network that will include every Iowa district and building. In the first year (2013-14) of implementation, the Legislature appropriated $3.5 million for planning grants to local school districts and every district in the state voluntarily applied for the grants. For each program year 2014-2017, additional monies have been allocated to support one-third of districts annually joining implementation of the Teacher Leadership and Compensation system. After the 2016-17 school year, the funding will be added into the school funding formula, making the system a permanent, fully-funded part of Iowa's schools.

Results of Infrastructure Analysis

Analysis of Iowa's infrastructure to ensure that learners who received special education services are proficient readers by the end of third grade indicate that Iowa is poised to provide supports that will assist learners to become proficient readers. Three major findings emerged from the examination of Iowa's infrastructure to support literacy instruction. They are described here and were essential for the selection of coherent improvement strategies. These findings are:
Structures, mechanisms and leadership exist to provide resources and supports to improve literacy instruction for all Iowa learners.
Successful implementation of a multi-tiered system of support is just emerging.
Focus on specially designed instruction has been lacking.

1. Structures, mechanisms and leadership to improve literacy instruction exist. Reorganization of the Department of Education, partnerships through C4K and the Teacher Leadership and Compensation legislation have all strengthened Iowa's infrastructure to provide literacy supports. As a result of the DOE internal reorganization, special education staff are naturally integrated into the broader work of the Department. For example, Bureau Chiefs are now responsible for the evaluation of special education staff in their bureaus which has increased their awareness of special education priorities and the specialized work of consultants. This means that upper management considers special education work as they make decisions, set priorities and assign resources on a daily basis. Indeed, two Bureau Chiefs are members of the internal DOE SSIP team.

The partnership between the DOE and the AEAs in Collaborating for Iowa's Kids (C4K) has formalized commitment across LEAs, AEAs and the DE to:

- Work as a unified system;
- Agree that the role of the DE is to set direction and lead, the role of the AEAs is to implement; and the role of the LEA is to support families and their children to be successful in school and in life; and
- Focus efforts and resources on selected priorities, (current priority is for all learners to be proficient readers by the end of third grade).

The collaborative structures instituted through C4K have provided infrastructure leverage in four ways: (1) Alignment of resources, including fiscal and personnel, focused on one current priority (literacy) across priority areas that have the greatest success across children/youth; (2) Collaboration of the DE, AEA and LEAs as part of C4K; (3) Identification/development of evidence-based frameworks, strategies and programs by experts in the

field regardless of affiliation or location; and (4) Intentional statewide scaling based on implementation science. The results of the collaborative work of this group in a little over two years include:

1. Created the infrastructure through which statewide literacy work is disseminated and supported;
2. Established Early Warning System in the area of reading - implemented in over 91% of the state's elementary public and non-public schools buildings - that identifies students in need of more support within weeks of starting school in the fall. This system includes:
   a. Iowa TIER, the state's data system that allows easy access to student data, as well as school system implementation information;
   b. Universal screening for all students from preschool through sixth grade;
   c. Progress monitoring for all students that indicates student progress in teacher-delivered interventions and supports from kindergarten through sixth grade –
3. Implemented coaches network for external and internal coaches serving 85 elementary school buildings;
4. Implemented leadership network for administrator/instructional leaders in 85 elementary school buildings in their second year of implementing MTSS; and
5. Identified evidence-based intervention programs at the universal, targeted and intensive levels within MTSS.

The Teacher Leadership and Compensation System has many components, some of which closely align with Iowa's needs for effective literacy instruction and work of C4K. Specifically, schools receive funding to have twenty-five percent of teachers become teacher-leaders. The majority of districts choose to provide reduced teaching loads to those teacher-leaders who then provide job-embedded professional learning opportunities to other staff. This system is designed to provide ongoing support for implementation of effective practices. While this provides an incredible infrastructure for the state, and a catalyst to provide ongoing training and technical assistance – it lacks critical evidence-based content in special education. An established coaching structure is critical and necessary – the absence of special education content within that structure provides both a challenge and an opportunity.

2. Successful implementation of a multi-tiered system of support is just emerging. A strong component of Iowa's infrastructure is the statewide data system for required universal screening and progress monitoring as established through C4K. The results of these data, however, indicate that less than half of Iowa elementary buildings have established a multi-system of support where 80% of their learners without IEPs meet reading benchmarks. This indicates there is much literacy work to be done statewide for all learners. The strong infrastructure is expected to be integral to improvement efforts.

Focus group conversations with over 150 parents, special education teachers, general education teachers, local special and general education administrators, Area Education Agency (AEA) consultants, AEA special education administrators, institutions of higher education, other state agencies and Department of Education Special Education staff overwhelmingly identified that while MTSS provides a needed model for all, there remains a need to embed a strong framework of specially designed instruction for learners with disabilities within the model.

Although OSEP and a number of states, including Iowa, have identified special education as embedded throughout all levels of the MTSS framework, the operationalization of specially designed instruction in this model was confusing to providers. The definition of specially designed instruction and the third tier of MTSS are not dichotomous, which can blur the distinction between specially designed instruction and effective instruction. As defined by IDEA, specially designed instruction "means adapting as appropriate to the needs of an eligible child under this part, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction [Sec. 300.39 (b)(3)]. In comparison, the third level of the MTSS framework is defined as an intensification of instruction which is individualized to the learner's needs. This intensification may mean altering variables such as instructional time, learning environment, cognitive strategies, and the delivery of instruction. Thus, both the definition of SDI and the definition of intensive instruction include individualization and adaptation, or altering, of instructional variables and strategies. When implemented with fidelity and individualized through specially designed instruction thus strengthening the impact of provided specially designed instruction on student progress within the core, the MTSS model supports a robust instructional core that is accessible to all, promoting fluidity between general and special education instruction. Unfortunately, the current reality in Iowa has only two percent of elementary buildings in the Winter, 2015 universal screening had 80% of learners with and without IEPs meeting reading benchmarks.

3. Focus on specially designed instruction (SDI) has been lacking. Indeed, initial focus group conversations identified a need to move beyond identification of eligibility for IDEA services to focus on specially designed instruction. Historically, AEAs have emphasized hiring staff who have skills in child find and monitoring compliance with IDEA regulations and, therefore, are organized to effectively address responsibilities in those areas. Professional development, for example, has largely centered on writing compliant IEPs. While this remains a critical area of focus, it has been woefully inadequate to serve the needs of learners with disabilities.

A review of current FTE distribution indicated that the majority of AEA special education staff have roles other than that of instructional coaching and support. Of the 788 FTE identified as core services in the AEA special education system, only thirty-eight percent were special education consultants. Even when adding the specialty positions such as transition consultants or parent-educator coordinators the percentage of those who could possibly provide external, ongoing support rose only to forty-three percent or a total of 369 FTE. Assuming that each of those individuals had the necessary knowledge and skills to support educators in the field, 369 is an inadequate number at best, to ensure the effective and efficient delivery of specially designed instruction in over 1,386 schools. If we are to change the trajectory of students with disabilities, the personnel charged with providing professional learning and technical assistance must have the knowledge and skills to support a change in instructional practice at the point of delivery.

Further conversations with additional groups of parents, teachers, administrators and faculty from institutes of higher education identified that there was no single common understanding of specially designed instruction beyond the definition provided in IDEA. Groups were unable to operationally define specially designed instruction so that it could be reliably observed in a classroom.

Absent clearly articulated features of specially designed instruction, it is impossible to determine fidelity of its implementation. This has resulted in significant variances across Iowa in the interpretation of specially designed instruction and thus a variation of the knowledge and skills expected for the delivery of specially designed instruction. Ultimately, these variances affect the growth and performance of learners identified as eligible for special education supports and services. In addition, without a clear understanding of specially designed instruction, it is impossible to efficiently organize resources and ensure that technical assistance and professional development activities are consistent and implemented with fidelity.

Summary of infrastructure analysis. Although Iowa has begun to build an infrastructure to support effective early literacy assessment and instruction, it is apparent that Iowa's current infrastructure is insufficient to address the amount of professional learning needed to ensure special educators have the ability to diagnose, design, and deliver high quality specially designed instruction so that learners with disabilities are proficient readers by the end of third grade. Specific infrastructure challenges to address include: (1) service delivery confusion and an historical focus on compliance/child find at the exclusion of instructional supports, (2) variability of implementation of evidence-based specially designed instruction, and (3) lack of evidence-based content in special education to support Iowa's newly enacted Teacher Leadership and Compensation system.

Alignment with State-level Initiatives

Iowa's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is directly connected to Iowa's rigorous academic standards for all learners and to ongoing efforts to improve teaching and learning. Indeed, Iowa's SSIP shares the same measureable result with the state's primary change vehicle, C4K: Every child is proficient in reading by the end of third grade. Analysis occurred at multiple levels and with multiple components. Descriptions of these analyses were embedded in the preceding sections.

Participants

Listed below are the representative roles that contributed to the development of Iowa's SSIP, Phase I. They will also be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of Iowa's SSIP. Their commitment to this work was evident in Iowa's recent proposal for a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). While the focus of the grant is specially designed instruction, Iowa selected the first content area to focus on early literacy, thus aligning completely with Iowa's SIMR. Letters of participation for the SPDG were provided by ASK Resource, the AEAs, Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel, a local school district and Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services.

Table 3. Listing of Roles Participating in Development of Phase I

· AEA Chiefs · AEA Directors of Special Education · AEA Instructional Services Directors · AEA Media Directors · AEA SPED Consultants · AEA Data Consultants · ASK Resource Center (Iowa's PTI) · Disability Rights Iowa (Iowa's P & A)	· DOE Chief, Bureau of Learner Supports and Strategies · DOE Chief, Bureau of School Improvement · DOE Director of Special Education · DOE Special Education Consultants · DOE Part C Coordinator and Consultants · Department of Human Services · Department of Justice · General education teachers and administrators	· Institutes of Higher Education · Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services · Individuals with Disabilities · Special education administrators, including special operated programs · Special education teachers · Parents · UEN Directors of Special Education

[1] Iowa's Early Warning System includes state-supported universal screening and progress monitoring assessments in the area of reading, and the data system to support data collection, analysis, reporting and immediate use to guide instruction.

[2] In addition to the McKenzie study, C4K reviewed John Hattie's book, *Visible Learning*. Hattie conducted extensive meta-analyses across interventions - third on the list of interventions with the greatest impact on achievement is MTSS with an effect size above 0.7. This provided additional support for our system to focus on MTSS as a priority area.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Increase the percentage of learners with disabilities that are proficient readers by the end of third grade.

Description

Iowa will increase the number of learners with disabilities that are proficient readers by the end of the third grade. Implementation of the SSIP will result in an increase in the number of children with IEPs scoring at or above benchmark on a valid and reliable literacy screening assessment, based on the assessment criterion cut point.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Overview of Improvement Strategies Acknowledging the input of those who contributed to Iowa's SSIP, the Iowa Department of Education worked with additional participants to operationally define and develop a much needed framework for Specially Designed Instruction (SDI). The primary group responsible for this work included 50 representatives of parents, general educators, special educators, building principals, AEA consultants, district directors of special education, AEA directors of special education, institutes of higher education and DOE staff. These participants also represented Iowa's most rural and urban districts. Over the past year, this group has identified four key components of specially designed instruction, each with their own set of critical features. For simplicity, the four key components are listed below. A full listing of components and critical features is attached as SDI Framework. 1. Diagnose for Instructional Design, 2. Design for Instructional Delivery, 3. Deliver for Learner Engagement, and 4. Engage for Learning. The SDI framework and Iowa's SIMR were used to form the foundation for Iowa's recently submitted proposal for OSEP's State Personnel Development Grants (SPDG). The strategies proposed there are the same ones Iowa will use to achieve its SIMR: Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of specially designed literacy instruction. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of specially designed literacy instruction with integrity. Deliver high quality professional development so that specially designed literacy instruction is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves reading proficiency for a wide range of learners. The backbone of the statewide system to ensure effective specially designed literacy instruction will be a collaborative partnership comprised of four critical teams: Core Team; Design Team; Delivery and Support Team; and Networking Teams. These teams parallel the structures established in C4K and co-participation of team leads will ensure alignment of activities. Extent to Which Improvement Strategies are Based on Data and Infrastructure Analysis Iowa has an emerging infrastructure for literacy support, however Iowa's special education service delivery model is currently focused almost exclusively on compliance and child find activities. In addition, principals and special education teachers have lost focus on the fundamental purpose of special education – to support students to access core content via specially design instruction. The proposed team structure enhances the one currently in use for general education. In order for the proposed team structure to be sustained, however, Iowa's special education service delivery model will need to be realigned and providers re-engaged. The challenge is to identify new organizational processes and structures while entrenched in maintaining day-to-day functioning of the organization. A critical activity, therefore, will be to develop innovative approaches for area and local education agencies to provide ongoing support for effective specially designed instruction. A think-tank of people who have special expertise in SDI, program management, leading change, data-based decision making and implementation science will be convened to examine possibilities and develop recommendations. This will include national consultants, AEA special education directors and other administration, Iowa's PTI Director, and Iowa Department of Education staff, including members of C4K and the Core Team. The think-tank will propose a redesigned service delivery model and recommend actions to ensure a technical assistance system that is cost effective and accessible including the use of technology, peer mentoring and distance learning – helping AEA and LEA personnel transition from a confused configuration of service delivery and primary support on compliance, child find and general education support, to an improved focus on specially designed instruction within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports. Quality tools, materials and professional development will be needed to build the capacity of Iowa's coaching network. In order to develop quality tools, materials and professional development the precise areas of knowledge and skills that parents, educators, and leaders need to diagnose, design and deliver specially designed literacy instruction will be assessed by the Design Team. Materials and tools will emphasize alphabetic principle and decoding, the two skills consistently lacking in the analysis of IEP learners who participated in the Winter, 2015 universal screening. The Design Team will also finalize the description of coach roles and responsibilities, provide direct training to the Delivery and Support Team, and evaluate the training provided, revising accordingly. Highly effective and ongoing professional learning opportunities will be needed to accomplish changes at the classroom level. This will be accomplished through the use of external and internal coaches. The Delivery and Support Team will serve as external coaches and will be comprised of personnel who are expert at professional learning, delivery and support within Iowa's educational system. These individuals will organize and provide professional development (face-to-face and online modules) based on the content established by the Design Team, as well as organize and provide ongoing support to internal coaches, including parents, leaders and coaches. Extent to Which Improvement Strategies are Sound, Logical and Aligned FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) 7/6/2015 Page 68 of 72 Iowa's framework for specially designed instruction has four key components: 1. Diagnose for Instructional Design, 2. Design for Instructional Delivery, 3. Deliver for Learner Engagement and 4. Engage for Learning (see attached for full description of the framework). Although this framework was purposely designed to be applicable to any content, e.g., literacy, math, behavior, communication, secondary transition, Iowa's SSIP will focus on applying the SDI framework to the content of literacy for PK-3 learners served under IDEA. Information used as the basis for these materials is described below. Early literacy instruction. Early literacy is described as the knowledge, skills, and dispositions learners need in order to read and write (National Reading Panel, 2000). In early literacy, the relationship between reading and writing is part of a communication network with speaking and listening (Lewis, 2000; Roskos, Christie, & Richgels, 2003; Thelen & Smith, 1995). Children need language in order to develop reading and writing skills, representing the reciprocal relationship between these two literacy elements. Hence, oral language is key to success in both reading and writing. Oral Language is "what is used to express ideas verbally and to understand language shared by others," (Cavanaugh, 2012, p. 32). It serves as the crucial beginning point in a young child's literacy development. Young children, from birth on, must have constant and continual exposure to language, building a crucial foundation in both speaking (expressive), and listening (receptive) vocabularies. Providing young children with many opportunities for interactive language experiences establishes both background knowledge and language skills which directly contribute to later literacy skill development in phonological awareness and print knowledge (Paulson & Moats, 2010) as well as vocabulary and listening comprehension. In fact, oral language serves as the primary vehicle in developing children's background knowledge and comprehension of the world around them (Schickendanz & Collins, 2012). This assists children in making connections to the text from the known to the unknown as well as new language opportunities with complex text. Using a comprehensive review of the literature, Iowa has established a vision for early literacy. Iowa's vision of effective literacy instruction for three year olds through third graders includes intervention for children at risk of having reading difficulties, will incorporate these essential elements: 1. Be built on evidence-based research; 2. Include instructional content for the essential components of reading (literacy) instruction (oral language, which includes phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency, and reading comprehension); 3. Include explicit instruction, coordinated instructional sequences, and ample teacher-directed application, guided practice, and independent practice; 4. Include instructional content that is aligned with the Iowa Early Learning Standards and Iowa Core standards; 5. Use instructional materials that are aligned with the Iowa Early Learning Standards and Iowa Core standards; 6. Provide more than 90 minutes of uninterrupted reading instruction per day (where learners are actively involved in reading and writing about text or exploring related literacy concepts and skills); 7. Include screening and diagnostic assessment for identifying and diagnosing individual student instructional needs; and 8. Include classroom-based assessments for frequent, ongoing monitoring of learner progress (Iowa Department of Education, 2006). Literacy instruction. Activities will begin by focusing on building the skills of educators so that they are able to diagnose and then design and deliver high quality SDI in the area of literacy. Special educators and those that design and deliver SDI will need enhanced understanding of the Early Learning Standards and Iowa Core, but also the research surrounding the teaching of reading for those that persistently struggle. They will need much deeper language and literacy content knowledge and a much broader set of skills and instructional expertise when it comes to the scientifically based practices that will accelerate learning for struggling readers, and will need to have the skills and support to be able to implement these practices and sustain them in their classrooms and buildings. Educators need to know and practice evidence-based ways to best teach reading to persistently struggling learners. For example, project participants will need to know that phonological awareness refers to an understanding that language is made up of words, rhymes, and sounds (phonemes). That phonemic awareness is one component of phonological awareness and it is the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate individual sounds- phonemes- in spoken words. For students with persistent reading difficulties phonemic awareness instruction needs to focus on accuracy and automaticity which is often very difficult for students with persistent reading difficulties. Current research has found that instruction at the phoneme level has the highest pay-off for reading and spelling. It is also true that the two phonemic awareness skills that have the highest leverage and impact with all readers, but especially struggling readers, are phoneme blending and phoneme segmentation. Research also informs us that decoding skills are necessary to learn to read, and knowledge of word meanings also helps children acquire printed word recognition and reading fluency (NICHD, 2000). Methods that have shown to have the strongest impact on students with persistent reading difficulties targeted the grapheme-phoneme (lettersound) elements throughout words (initial, medial and final positions) and provided explicit instruction on spelling patterns in words. For persistently struggling students, each stage must be modeled and practiced using explicit and systematic instruction and extensive review and research indicates that outcomes are superior when phonics and decoding instruction is accompanied by significant opportunities to use these skills in reading and writing activities (Lyon & Weiser, 2009; Pressley, 2006). Educators also need to know that another way to improve decoding skills for struggling readers is to teach spelling using a systematic and scientifically based approach. Research studies have found that the teaching of spelling, for persistently struggling readers, needs to be based on linguistic patterns and

spelling generalizations. This means that spelling is not a memory task. Students with reading difficulties benefit from direct and explicit instruction in spelling that is aligned to the decoding patterns that they are learning in their reading (Moats, 2009; Moats, 2006; Moats 2005). Research studies have also found that persistently struggling readers benefit from the direct teaching of morphological structures or what are identified as the meaningful units in words. This means that instruction needs to focus on the parts of words that carry meaning (i.e., s, ing, ed, ex) in addition to sounds in words (Moats, 2010; Moats, 2005). While Iowa educators have heard about fluency, it is important that project participants understand that reading fluency refers to efficient and effective word recognition skills that permit a reader to construct the meaning of text. For persistently struggling readers, it is a must that project participants know how to provide the type of instruction that fosters automaticity in word recognition. The brain has only a limited amount of what researchers call “desk space” or attention capacity. Project participants must know how to provide the level of direct instruction and practice that will cause learners to rapidly recognize word patterns, spacing, word meanings, and punctuation so that they can ultimately comprehend what they are reading. Research studies have also found that struggling readers need to build both depth and breadth of vocabulary at the same time that they are building their decoding skills. This means that project participants will need to know how to integrate the teaching of the meaning of words while struggling readers are also learning to decode the words. The full recognition of a word requires an association with its meaning as well. In order to accomplish this, participants will need to work together to provide both explicit and implicit methods of vocabulary instruction for persistently struggling readers. Addressing the ever-widening language gap means accelerating the word-learning rate of children who are behind. Leading researchers (Beck, et al., 2002, Graves, 2006: Stahl & Nagy, 2006) agree that it is not possible for teachers to teach 2,000-3,000 words directly every year. Students with persistent reading difficulties, who need more of a direct instruction approach, will need word learning opportunities that build in more scaffolding. Finally, in regards to comprehension, a review of reading comprehension studies with students with persistent reading difficulties supports the use of strategies recommended by the National Reading Panel (2000). These strategies are also most effective when students learn and practice them in meaningful contexts and when they are FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) 7/6/2015 Page 69 of 72 bundled. The Design Team will use Iowa data, research and national experts to organize evidence-based practices for instruction in literacy within the SDI framework and develop professional learning tools, materials and opportunities. Literacy instruction for those with significant cognitive disabilities. The emphasis on creating and sustaining meaningful access to the general education curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities has increased over the last decade (Browder, Wakeman, Flowers, Rickelman, Pugalee, & Karvonen, 2007). Recent legislation, including the 1997 and 2004 amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 have provided the impetus for change. With the intent of providing equitable educational opportunities for students with significant cognitive disabilities, recent State of Iowa initiatives have centered upon the development of challenging and rigorous alternate achievement standards- the Iowa Core Essential Elements in English Language Arts (ELA). In addition, measuring student achievement in relation to Iowa Core Essential Elements in ELA through the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment, the State of Iowa’s Accountability Assessment and Iowa requirements for Early Literacy Implementation specific to students with significant cognitive disabilities has emphasized greater accountability on behalf of school districts and teachers. Specially designed instruction for students with significant disabilities as it relates to literacy, stems from an increasing array of research evidence which convincingly demonstrates that children with significant cognitive disabilities associated with communication and intellectual impairments can dramatically develop in their critical literacy profiles (see Broderick & Kasa-Hendrickson, 2001; Erickson & Koppenhaver, 1995; Foley & Staples, 2003; Kliewer & Landis, 1999), provided professional educators have the necessary knowledge and skills. A recent research monograph provides insights on original scholarship in the area of specially designed instruction for learners with significant cognitive disabilities (University of North Carolina Center for Literacy and Disability Studies), specific to (1) phonological awareness and phonemic skills (2) decoding and the teaching of spelling (3) vocabulary (4) comprehension and (5) fluency. Research regarding phonemic/phonological awareness for students with significant disabilities/complex communication needs indicate that these students do develop these skills in reading; however, they experience difficulty with tasks based on the load each task places on phonological memory rather than the size of the unit being analyzed (Larsson& Sandberg, 2008). Research also finds that students with significant disabilities/complex communication needs to do not follow the pattern of first learning to process sounds at the word level and then progress to processing sounds at the syllable and phoneme level. In the area of decoding and the teaching of spelling, studies surrounding word identification for students with significant disabilities/complex support needs indicate that increased opportunities to focus on the printed word increased performance. Vocabulary instruction should distinguish between word identification instruction and vocabulary instruction for students with significant disabilities. Sight word instruction is not the same as vocabulary instruction. Several strategies have been successful in teaching comprehension to learners with significant disabilities, including: cooperative learning; answering and generating questions; and story structure. Finally, fluency is dependent on its application. If the application of fluency is to oral reading, this group of learners will be excluded; however, if the construct of fluency is carried over from oral to silent reading then the challenge exists to find a measure that can be employed to reliably measure progress. The Iowa Department of Education, in partnership with numerous national and state entities, has been invested in specially designed literacy instruction for learners with significant cognitive disabilities since 2009. Strong partnerships amongst the Iowa Department of Education, Center for Literacy and Disabilities Studies, UNC Chapel Hill, faculty from University of Northern Iowa Special Education and Communication Sciences and Disorders Departments, Area Education Agencies, Local Education Agencies, and Iowa families have resulted in outreach to a small number of interdisciplinary teams and begun the development of online literacy modules specific to this population of learners. Iowa’s SSIP will build upon this work by continuing to refine the learning content of the modules, expand the number of interdisciplinary teams who receive training and support and through partnership with University of Northern Iowa, validate a Literacy Observational Tool that will be used to provide an accurate understanding of teacher dispositions, knowledge/skills and gaps in services. The Literacy Observational Assessment Tool assesses the degree to which teachers provide specially designed literacy instruction within the universal tier of MTSS and provides a framework for decision-making and planning of professional development to support teachers’ needs. Likelihood that Improvement Strategies will Increase the Percentage of Learners who Received Special Education who are Proficient Readers by the End of Third Grade and Build Capacity of State Infrastructure and Scale-up Iowa’s SSIP applies the elements of implementation science to achieve large-scale improvements. As can be seen in Figure 2 (attached), activities directly align within the implementation science frameworks adapted by the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (Blase & Fixsen, 2013) including usable interventions (the What) and implementation drivers (the How). In order to increase the effectiveness of specially designed instruction and ensure successful full implementation and sustainability, leadership and implementation teams will be established to address barriers and provide support. Four critical teams (Core Team, Design Team, Delivery and Support Team, Networking Teams) will provide leadership and support for participating buildings and develop implementation guides and practice profiles for key components of specially designed literacy instruction. Implementation drivers of personnel competencies, organizational infrastructures and leadership capacities for changing the current system to one that delivers effective specially designed literacy instruction will also be assessed and improved. Iowa’s SSIP is designed in implementation stages beginning with development of materials and teams in the 2015-16 school year. The Delivery and Support Team will include a minimum of 55 participants from Iowa’s eight largest districts, nine area education agencies and parent networks. Areas of expertise that members will bring include, coaching, early childhood, literacy, parent/school engagement, significant cognitive disabilities and specially designed instruction. Given this wide range of knowledge and skill sets, professional development will be critical for the Delivery and Support Team. Members of the Delivery and Support Team will complete a self-assessment and professional learning materials will be tailored to meet their needs based on the self-assessment. These materials will be provided in a number of formats including: two annual face-to-face meetings, monthly follow-up webinars, on-line modules and individual coaching, as needed. **Two cohort groups will be targeted to participate in SSIP activities. Each cohort will include 70 buildings for a total of 140 buildings. This represents 70% of the 203 elementary buildings with 60% or more of their learners without disabilities who reached their reading benchmarks on Winter 2015 universal screeners, but with 39% or fewer of their learners with disabilities who met them. Cohort One buildings will be selected during the 2015-16 school year and Cohort Two buildings will be selected during the 2017-18 school year. Criteria for selection will be finalized by the Design Team and will include: 1. Participation in Iowa’s established MTSS model; 2. Implementation of state approved universal screening and progress monitoring assessment; 3. Demonstrated robust instructional core, or an active plan to remediate the instructional core; 4. Representation across proficiency levels and growth trajectories of learners with disabilities in literacy; and 5. Demonstrated administrative support, and staff consensus to participate. Iowa’s SSIP integrates all of the characteristics associated with large-scale reform—effective innovations for SDI in literacy, effective implementation, and enabling FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) 7/6/2015 Page 70 of 72 contexts—and is thus likely to result in sustained improvement of specially designed instruction so that learners with disabilities are successful readers by the end of third grade. In addition to adhering to effective implementation science practices, the proposed project design parallels the design of Iowa’s infrastructure for statewide delivery and support - Collaborating for Iowa’s Kids (C4K) and SSIP activities are designed to infuse specially designed instruction within C4K activities. A critical need within C4K is evidence-based content in the area of specially designed instruction that can be easily embedded into MTSS, and therefore within existing structures. Stakeholder Involvement The overall focus on effective specially designed instruction as an improvement strategy was selected by over 150 representatives of parents, special education teachers, general education teachers, local special and general education administrators, Area Education Agency (AEA) consultants, AEA special education administrators, institutions of higher education, other state agencies and Department of Education Special Education staff. Another group of 50 representatives of parents, general educators, special educators, building principals, AEA consultants, district directors of special education, AEA directors of special education, institutes of higher education and DOE staff worked to define Iowa’s SDI framework. These participants also represented Iowa’s most rural and urban districts. This information was then used by a smaller group to articulate the strategies and activities that became the foundation of Iowa’s SSIP and proposal for the State Personnel Development Grants (SPDG). Members of this last group included the DE lead for C4K, the director of ASK Resource Center (Iowa’s Parent Training and Information Center), the State Director of Special Education, and DE consultants with expertise in Early Childhood, Literacy, Parent Engagement and Significant Intellectual Disabilities. Iowa’s State Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), as with all SSSIP components, reviewed work as it was developed, provided feedback and supported these improvement activities.

**NOTE: This is the original Phase I proposal. Implementation planning in 2015 suggested that Iowa is not ready to implement cohort work in 2016-17. Phase II proposal adjusts the timeline for cohort implementation.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

All narrative provided in Phase I is relevant for the implementation of SSIP Phase II with one exception noted below (and updated in

Phase I). This means that all stakeholder involvement and alignment with other initiatives continue in Phase II. Details regarding Phase II requirements are largely presented in attachments. A reader's guide was developed to assist in location of specific information and is attached.

Iowa selected three improvement strategies to ensure increased percent of third graders who are proficient readers by the end of third grade:

1. Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of specially designed literacy instruction.
2. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of specially designed literacy instruction with integrity.
3. Deliver high quality professional development so that specially designed literacy instruction is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves reading proficiency for a wide range of learners.

These three strategies are inter-related and affect both infrastructure development and support for LEA implementation of effective based strategies. For simplicity, the first two strategies are discussed here, within Infrastructure Development and the third strategy is discussed within Implementation of Evidence Based Practices.

The backbone of the statewide system to ensure effective specially designed literacy instruction will be a collaborative partnership comprised of four critical teams: Core Team; Design Team; Delivery and Support Team; and Networking Teams. These teams parallel the structures established in C4K and co-participation of team leads will ensure alignment of activities. The establishment of these teams, in itself, is a change in the current infrastructure. A description of the teams and their relationship to each other can be found in *Table 1. Teams, Membership and Responsibilities* (see attached). The Iowa Department of Education is deeply committed to the work of the SSIP and as such is dedicating 100% of its State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) for this work. Included in the SPDG is a subcontract to Iowa's PTI. Iowa Department of Education is also dedicating additional DOE staff time to serve as leads on each of the committees. *Table 2. Person Loading Chart* identifies the time that each role will give to accomplishing SSIP activities.

Iowa began development of Phase II of the SSIP by developing literacy materials and professional learning strategies in Summer, 2015 and testing them with twelve usability sites, beginning Fall, 2015. Although only four months of work with usability sites has been completed, there are a number of findings which serve as the basis for the activities and timelines outlined in this Implementation Plan. These findings were:

- Variability across districts was expected, but it was greater than anticipated. Tools to determine district readiness for implementation and to differentiate professional learning are needed. The materials must include identification of existing infrastructure and leadership supports.
- Coaching expectations/roles need stronger clarification. Coaches need more opportunities to build capacity prior to engaging school teams.
- Teachers want/need to get through the key components of the SDI framework (diagnose, design, deliver) so they can engage their students immediately. Going deeply into one component and waiting 3 months before the next component is introduced was frustrating to participants.
- **We are not ready to implement Cohort I.** To do that we need full development of our content and our coaching materials. Further discussion of cohort selection, size and timelines can be found in Implementation of Evidence Based Practices.

Emphasis, therefore, will be to design and test a coaching platform prior to engaging a cohort. The coaching platform will:

- Be an inquiry based model that explores the kind of coaching needed for content and system coaching
- Identify common set of competencies (based on the answers to the above)
- Identify what is specific to the content area
- Identify system support needs
- Describe the end user side
- Describe when one gets engaged and how one gets engaged
- Provide a clear delineation of coaching for literacy and coaching systems of support for literacy instruction across the strands
- Identify non-negotiables

The coaching platform will be developed with the participation of AEA and LEA partners, institutions of higher education, and aligned with work of C4K and TLC. This work will be supported through outside technical assistance with national experts in the area of coaching as well as existing supports through the SigNetwork.

Table 3 (see attached) identifies major tasks, activities and timelines to accomplish each of Iowa's three improvement strategies. Timelines for completion and implementation of the coaching platform can be found in Activity 1.1. The first objective in Table 1 mirrors strategy 1: Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of specially designed instruction. Additional activities to complete this objective are further outlined on pages

1-2 in Table 3.

Iowa's second major strategy to increase the percentage of third graders with IEPs who are proficient readers is to build the capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of specially designed instruction with integrity. Major activities to accomplish this work are outlined on the third page of Table 3 under Objective 2. As mentioned above, preliminary work with twelve usability sites indicates that coaching supports need to be strengthened before beginning work with building teams. Projected timelines are to complete development of coaching competencies and readiness tools in Summer 2016. Intensive supports would be provided to coaches in summer and fall- with building level implementation beginning in Winter. Supports will include face-to-face professional learning, webinars, on-site modeling and feedback and personal learning communities.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Iowa selected three improvement strategies to ensure increased percent of third graders who are proficient readers by the end of third grade:

1. Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of specially designed literacy instruction.
2. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of specially designed literacy instruction with integrity.
3. Deliver high quality professional development so that specially designed literacy instruction is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves reading proficiency for a wide range of learners.

These three strategies are inter-related and affect both infrastructure development and support for LEA implementation of effective based strategies. For simplicity, the first two strategies were discussed within Infrastructure Development and the third strategy is discussed here within Implementation of Evidence Based Practices.

As discussed in Infrastructure Development, preliminary work with twelve usability sites indicated that Iowa is not ready to implement Cohort I. Our original proposal from Phase I was:

Two cohort groups will be targeted to participate in SSIP activities. Each cohort will include 70 buildings for a total of 140 buildings. This represents 70% of the 203 elementary buildings with 60% or more of their learners without disabilities who reached their reading benchmarks on Winter 2015 universal screeners, but with 39% or fewer of their learners with disabilities who met them. Cohort One buildings will be selected during the 2015-16 school year and Cohort Two buildings will be selected during the 2017-18 school year.

Instead, Iowa will initiate another year of usability testing. In the 2016-17 school year ten to twelve new schools will be identified to participate in usability testing of both literacy content and coaching supports, including implementation fidelity. The twelve sites that participated in the 2015-16 usability testing will be invited to continue during the 2016-17 school year. This means that up to twenty-four sites may participate in the 2016-17 school year. Cohort I site selection of up to 70 schools will occur in 2017 for implementation during the 2017-18 school year. An additional Cohort II selection is targeted for the 2018-19 school year for implementation in the 2019-20 school year. Major activities and timelines can be found on page 4 of Table 3. Responsibilities for these activities and time commitments are found in *Table 2. Person Loading Chart*.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

The Iowa Department of Education, through its SPDG, has hired Measurement, Incorporated to conduct the evaluation of all SSIP activities. Measurement Incorporated responded to a Request for Proposals based on the logic model submitted with Iowa's SPDG. As can be seen in Figure 1, the SPDG logic model directly aligns with the Iowa's Theory of Action (Figure 2) and includes both short and long term objectives. The evaluation, therefore, is directly aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP. Detailed description of the evaluation plan is attached. Evaluation information will be used by the Core Team, Design Teams, SEAP and other stakeholders to make summative and formative decisions.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Iowa's biggest area of need is in the development of an infrastructure that will increase the effectiveness of specially designed instruction at the systems level and within the specific content of literacy. We currently recieve technical assistance from an outside contractor and through the SigNetwork. We will continue to recieve support from these sources and look forward to other support opportunities.

Phase III submissions should include:

• Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
• Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
• Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Please see attached document: Iowa's SSIP Phase III Progress Report

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Please see attached document: Iowa's SSIP Phase III Progress Report

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Please see attached document: Iowa's SSIP Phase III Progress Report

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Please see attached document: Iowa's SSIP Phase III Progress Report

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

Please see attached document: Iowa's SSIP Phase III Progress Report

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Please see attached document: Iowa's SSIP Phase III Progress Report

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Barbara Guy

Title: State Director of Special Education

Email: barbara.guy@iowa.gov

Phone: 515-281-3527